DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 258 921 SO 016 703

AUTHOR Jones, Alan H., Ed.
TITLE Civic Learning for Teachers: Capstone for Educational Reform. Proceedings of the Seminar on Civic Learning in the Education of the Teaching Profession (Stanford, California, November 11-13, 1984).
SPONS AGENCY Charles F. Kettering Foundation, Dayton, Ohio.
REPORT NO ISBN-911168-63-X
PUB DATE 85
NOTE 187p.
AVAILABLE FROM Prakken Publications, Inc., Post Office Box 8623, Ann Arbor, MI 48107 ($10.00).
PUB TYPE Collected Works - Conference Proceedings (021) -- Books (010) -- Viewpoints (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Education; Citizen Participation; *Citizenship Education; Citizenship Responsibility; Constitutional History; Constitutional Law; *Educational Change; *Educational Needs; Elementary Secondary Education; Humanities; Humanities Instruction; Law Schools; Psychology; Public Administration Education; Public Affairs Education, School Role; Schools of Education; *Social Studies; *Teacher Education

ABSTRACT

This seminar discussed the civic preparation that educators themselves need to enable them to better prepare elementary and secondary students to become more effective and responsible citizens. The proceedings began with a paper on "Civil Learning for Teachers: Capstone for Educational Reform," by R. Freeman Butts. Following this, the five general sessions of the conference are presented. The focus of the first session was the different meanings of civic learning. Papers presented were: "Thinking Publicly about Civic Learning: An Agenda for Education Reform in the 80s" (Barbara Finkelstein); "Thinking about Civic Education" (James M. Banner, Jr.); "Civic Education: Parsing the Problem" (Bernard Murchland); and "Comparisons on Civic Education" (Mary Anne Raywid). The second general session dealt with what the humanities should contribute to the civic learning of teachers and administrators. Papers presented were: "The Humanities of Civic Learning" (Sidney Hook); "Getting the House in Order" (Larry T. McGehee); "Informed Consent: The Humanities as Civic Education" (Donald R. Warren); and "Civic Learning and the Humanities: Some Presuppositions of the Inquiry" (Christopher J. Lucas). The third general session dealt with the question of what the social sciences should contribute to the civic learning of teachers and administrators. Papers presented were: "Reflections on Potential Contributions of the Social Sciences to Civic Education, with Special Reference to Schools of Public Affairs" (Manfred Stanley); "The Social Sciences and the Civic Education of Teachers and Administrators" (James P. Shaver); "Constitutional and Legal History and the Civic Learning of Teachers and Administrators" (Paul L. Murphy); and "Evidence for Balancing Content with Process and Balancing Answers with Questions: The Contribution of Psychology to the Civic Education of Teachers" (Judith Torney-Purta). The fourth general session concerned the contribution that schools of education should make to the civic learning of teachers and administrators.

Papers presented were: "Needed Decisions in the Civic Education of Teachers: An Agenda for Action" (Richard E. Gross); "Essential Decisions and Consensus" (Charles A. Tesconi, Jr.); and "The Social Context for Essential Decisions" (Faustine C. Jones-Wilson). The fifth general session discussed what schools of law and public administration should contribute to the civic learning of teachers and administrators. Papers presented were: "What Schools of Law Could Contribute to the Civic Learning of the Teaching Profession" (C. Hugh Friedman); and "The Recovery of Civism in Public Administration" (H. George Frederickson). Other seminar presentations included "The Centrality of Public Education" (J. Myron Atkin) and "Intersecting Themes" (Donald Kennedy). Reports of the discussion groups are also included. (RM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED258921

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Civic Learning for Teachers: Capstone for Educational Reform

Proceedings of the Seminar on Civic Learning in the Education of the Teaching Profession

Held November 11-13, 1984
at the
Hoover Institution on War, Revolution and Peace
Stanford University, Stanford, California

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Prakken Publications
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY

SO 016 703

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Civic Learning for Teachers: Capstone for Educational Reform

Proceedings of the Seminar on Civic Learning in the Education of the Teaching Profession

Held November 11-13, 1984
at the
Hoover Institution on War, Revolution and Peace
Stanford University, Stanford, California

Edited by Alan H. Jones

Published by Prakken Publications
Ann Arbor, Michigan

1985

Prakken Publications

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

© 1985 by Prakken Publications, Inc.

CIVIC LEARNING FOR TEACHERS: CAPSTONE FOR EDUCATIONAL REFORM
Proceedings of the Seminar on Civic Learning in the Education of the Teaching Profession
Held November 11-13, 1984, at the Hoover Institution on War, Revolution and Peace, Stanford University, Stanford, California
Edited by Alan H. Jones
Published by Prakken Publications, Inc., Post Office Box 8623, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48107
ISBN 911168-63-X
List Price - $10.00

I-1
5

Foreword

Primary credit for this volume and for the Seminar on Civic Learning in the Education of the Teaching Profession upon which it is based belongs to R. Freeman Butts, whose many years of scholarship and leadership in the field of civic education are an inspiration to all who have had the good fortune to work with him or in other ways to profit from his contributions to public education. His colleagues at the Hoover Institution for War, Revolution and Peace, Paul R. Hanna and Gerald A. Dorfman, and Richard E. Gross of the Stanford University School of Education, joined in coordinating the Seminar on behalf of the host institution.

Financial support for the Seminar and for publication of this volume of proceedings has been provided by the Kettering Foundation. Other co-sponsors of the Seminar were the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, the American Educational Studies Association, the Association of American Colleges, the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, the Hewlett Foundation, the National Council for the Social Studies, the National Endowment for the Humanities, Project '87 of the American Historical Association and the

American Political Science Association, and the Society of Professors of Education, along with the Hoover Institution, the Stanford School of Education, and the Kettering Foundation.

Each of the Seminar participants deserves recognition for contributing to the ideas reported in this volume, and the seventeen participants who presented papers which appear in the volume have directly assisted through the preparation of revisions and reactions during the process of editing and publication.

The resulting volume represents the proceedings of the Seminar as it was held November 11 through 13, 1984, at Stanford. Following an introduction by Butts and listings of the sponsors and participants, reports appear on each of the sessions of the seminar, including the text of the seventeen papers and brief descriptions of the discussion following such presentations. The volume closes with reports of seven seminar discussion groups charged with developing recommendations, a composite report on those recommendations, a bibliography of sources in the field of civic education, and a note on continuing activities of the Seminar participants.

—ALAN H. JONES
Executive Editor
Prakken Publications, Inc.

07

Table of Contents

CIVIC LEARNING FOR TEACHERS: CAPSTONE FOR EDUCATIONAL REFORM—R. Freeman Butts 1

CO-SPONSORS OF THE SEMINAR 7
PARTICIPANTS IN THE SEMINAR 8

FIRST GENERAL SESSION: THE DIFFERENT MEANINGS OF CIVIC LEARNING 12

THINKING PUBLICLY ABOUT CIVIC LEARNING: AN AGENDA FOR EDUCATION REFORM IN THE 80s—Barbara Finkelstein 13

THINKING ABOUT CIVIC EDUCATION—James M. Banner, Jr. 25

CIVIC EDUCATION: PARSING THE PROBLEM—Bernard Murchland 33

COMPARISONS ON CIVIC EDUCATION—
Mary Anne Raywid 37

DISCUSSION AT FIRST GENERAL SESSION 42

SECOND GENERAL SESSION: WHAT SHOULD THE HUMANITIES CONTRIBUTE TO THE CIVIC LEARNING OF TEACHERS AND ADMINISTRATORS? 43

THE HUMANITIES OF CIVIC LEARNING—
Sidney Hook 44

GETTING THE HOUSE IN ORDER—Larry T. McGehee .. 50

INFORMED CONSENT: THE HUMANITIES AS CIVIC EDUCATION—Donald R. Warren 54

CIVIC LEARNING AND THE HUMANITIES: SOME PRESUPPOSITIONS OF THE INQUIRY—
Christopher J. Lucas 59

DISCUSSION AT SECOND GENERAL SESSION 65

THIRD GENERAL SESSION: WHAT SHOULD THE SOCIAL SCIENCES CONTRIBUTE TO THE CIVIC LEARNING OF TEACHERS AND ADMINISTRATORS? 66

REFLECTIONS ON POTENTIAL CONTRIBUTIONS OF THE SOCIAL SCIENCES TO CIVIC EDUCATION, WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO SCHOOLS OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS—Manfred Stanley 67

THE SOCIAL SCIENCES AND THE CIVIC EDUCATION OF TEACHERS AND ADMINISTRATORS—
James P. Shaver 73

CONSTITUTIONAL AND LEGAL HISTORY AND THE CIVIC LEARNING OF TEACHERS AND ADMINISTRATORS—Paul L. Murphy 84

EVIDENCE FOR BALANCING CONTENT WITH PROCESS AND BALANCING ANSWERS WITH QUESTIONS: THE CONTRIBUTION OF PSYCHOLOGY TO

CO 09

THE CIVIC EDUCATION OF TEACHERS—
Judith Torney-Purta 91

DISCUSSION AT THIRD GENERAL SESSION 100

FOURTH GENERAL SESSION: WHAT SHOULD SCHOOLS OF EDUCATION CONTRIBUTE TO THE CIVIC LEARNING OF TEACHERS AND ADMINISTRATORS? 101

NEEDED DECISIONS IN THE CIVIC EDUCATION OF TEACHERS: AN AGENDA FOR ACTION—
Richard E. Gross 102

ESSENTIAL DECISIONS AND CONSENSUS—
Charles A. Tesconi, Jr. 110

THE SOCIAL CONTEXT FOR ESSENTIAL DECISIONS—
Faustine C. Jones-Wilson 115

DISCUSSION AT FOURTH GENERAL SESSION 121

FIFTH GENERAL SESSION: WHAT SHOULD SCHOOLS OF LAW AND PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION CONTRIBUTE TO THE CIVIC LEARNING OF TEACHERS AND ADMINISTRATORS? 122

WHAT SCHOOLS OF LAW COULD CONTRIBUTE TO THE CIVIC LEARNING OF THE TEACHING PROFESSION—C. Hugh Friedman 123

THE RECOVERY OF CIVISM IN PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION—H. George Frederickson 130

DISCUSSION AT FIFTH GENERAL SESSION 139

RECEPTION AND DINNER:
PRESENTATIONS AND DISCUSSION 140

THE CENTRALITY OF PUBLIC EDUCATION—
J. Myron Atkin 141

INTERSECTING THEMES—Donald Kennedy 143

CLOSING GENERAL SESSION:
REPORTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 148

REPORT OF DISCUSSION GROUP NUMBER ONE 149
REPORT OF DISCUSSION GROUP NUMBER TWO 151
REPORT OF DISCUSSION GROUP NUMBER THREE .. 153
REPORT OF DISCUSSION GROUP NUMBER FOUR ... 155
REPORT OF DISCUSSION GROUP NUMBER FIVE 158
REPORT OF DISCUSSION GROUP NUMBER SIX 161
REPORT OF DISCUSSION GROUP NUMBER SEVEN .. 164

SEMINAR RECOMMENDATIONS—Alan H. Jones 166

BIBLIOGRAPHY 170

CLOSING NOTE 176

Civic Learning for Teachers: Capstone for Educational Reform

By R. Freeman Butts

A remarkable, and possibly historic, gathering of educators recently took steps that could place a fitting capstone on the present educational reform movement. It is a capstone that could reinforce, not weaken or fragment or overload, the very foundational purpose upon which free, universal, common schooling was originally envisioned and created in the United States: namely, its civic mission to prepare informed, rational, and humane citizens for effective participation in a democratic political community.

The recent proposals for structural reform of American education and the accompanying public debate have given far too little attention to the substantive ideas, content, or spirit of educational programs that will lead to civic intelligence and civic virtue essential for achieving the common purposes and values of the Republic.

To remedy this neglect, a national seminar was convened at the Hoover Institution for War, Revolution and Peace of Stanford University in early November 1984 on the theme "Civic Learning in the Education of the Teaching Profession." The conveners believed that this is a particularly good time for renewing discussion of the historic

ideas and values of American citizenship; reexamining the role American educators should play in shaping the civic knowledge, values, and skills of their students; and determining the civic preparation that educators themselves need to enable them better to prepare their students in elementary and secondary schools to become more effective and responsible citizens.

Now it may not immediately be clear to the public why such a gathering could be historic. But to those of us who have studied the successive waves of educational reform of the past 100 years, or who have lived through "reforms" of the past 50 years, the significance may be more apparent. In the 1880s the superintendents of the burgeoning common schools were pleading with the colleges and universities to undertake the professional training of teachers, a movement in which for the preceding 50 years the universities had taken little or no part and had contributed almost nothing. Thereupon, some major universities began to respond, typified by the inauguration of Teachers College in 1894 when the presidents of Columbia (Seth Low), Harvard (Charles W. Eliot), and Johns Hopkins (Daniel Coit Gilman) gave their academic blessings to the new venture, soon to be affiliated with Columbia University.

But what happened? The new departments and schools of education became so aggressive and so popular and, in the view of many of their colleagues, so inferior academically, that by November 1944 when Teachers College celebrated its 50th anniversary by inviting the presidential successors of those three leading universities to speak, Harvard's President James Bryant Conant felt impelled to call for "A Truce Among Educators." The "academic warfare," the "sniping," the "enemy fire" had become so intense that Conant urged a cease fire in the criticism levelled at the "educationists" and an armistice between the warring educational factions, between the academics and the professional educators. As a young professor, I was present in Horace Mann Auditorium, having already undergone the baptism of fire of which Conant spoke.

President Conant's prestige and his studies in the early 1960s sponsored by the Carnegie Corporation helped in many ways—for a time. But it is all too apparent that old hostilities are still reverberating in the name of educational reform, characterized by such suggestions as wiping out undergraduate programs in teacher education, reducing the influence of schools of education in the preparation of teachers, bypassing them in certification or credentialling, drastically reducing their number, or doing away with them altogether.

Nevertheless, Paul R. Hanna, Gerald A. Dorfman, Richard E. Gross, and I believed that the time was right for another try at bringing

together key persons representing the scholarly disciplines of the humanities and social sciences and key professors and administrators in the professional field of teacher education in order to explore ways in which the civic preparation of teachers might be improved through experimentation, innovation, and research in a variety of college and university programs.

We believed that the intellectual climate in universities and colleges was now more hospitable to such ideas than it had been for many years. In January 1983, the Association of American Colleges devoted its entire convention to the theme of "The Civic Purposes of Liberal Learning," and, with the help of the Kettering Foundation, published a special edition of its quarterly, *Liberal Education* (Winter 1982), on this theme. The National Endowment for the Humanities was sponsoring for teachers several projects aimed at better teaching of the civic humanities in secondary schools.

The time was thus ripe for similar efforts in teacher education. Some of the most influential university presidents of leading research universities were in the process of reassessing and elevating the role of their schools of education not only within the university community but in relation to the public schools of their regions and of the nation. In his Carnegie Report on the high school Ernest Boyer argued that bold new reforms were needed in teacher education.

Fortunately, the momentum was also picking up within schools of education. The Society of Professors of Education had recently published a volume on *Civic Learning in Teacher Education* (July 1983) highlighting the views of several deans and professors of major schools of education. A special issue of the *Journal of Teacher Education* (November-December 1983), co-sponsored by seven professional education associations with the help of Kettering, brought to bear on the same theme the views of a distinguished roster of university presidents and professors of the academic disciplines. The National Commission on Excellence in Teacher Education was due to issue its report by February 1985 and a group of deans of leading research universities was at work to formulate new standards of teacher education in their institutions.

We believed, therefore, that this Seminar had a timely and urgent opportunity to influence the academic, professional, and public discussion of the reform of teacher education. The readiness and enthusiasm with which a dozen foundations and academic organizations agreed to sponsor the Seminar testified to our belief.

In response to our invitations some 60 educators came from a dozen academic organizations and 32 different colleges and universities, large and small, public and private, from all parts of the country. Despite

their disparate scholarly disciplines and professional expertise they were united in wishing to improve the civic education of the American people by strengthening the liberal and professional preparation of those who teach and administer America's massive educational enterprise.

The participants were almost equally divided between those who work in the liberal arts and sciences outside of schools or departments of education and those who work inside. They met to explore ways by which they might collaborate within a variety of institutions of higher education in order to mobilize their entire academic communities on behalf of the civic purposes of public education. They recognized that their task would not be easy. The "war" between "academics" and "educationists" has been waging since long before President Conant felt compelled to call for a truce among educators.

Now, the seminar did not gather to praise the schools of education—or to bury them. The gathering at Stanford was co-sponsored by preeminent organizations devoted broadly to the promotion of the scholarly arts and sciences and significant organizations devoted to the professional education of teachers and administrators. They were the Kettering Foundation, the National Endowment for the Humanities, the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, the Hewlett Foundation, the Association of American Colleges, Project '87 (jointly sponsored by the American Historical Association and the American Political Science Association), the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, the American Educational Studies Association, the Society of Professors of Education, the National Council for the Social Studies, and the Stanford University School of Education, as well as the Hoover Institution.

Each of these organizations nominated several individuals to be invited to the Seminar. The 60 individuals came, not to speak for their organizations, not simply to declare another academic cease fire, nor to reach a concordat defining separate spheres of influence within the academic turf. Rather, they sought to identify grounds on which genuine collaboration could be achieved by focusing their efforts, not on college education in general, but on civic learning as a theme common to their very purposes as scholars and educators of the American citizenry. They heard and discussed seventeen scholarly papers which appear in this volume. These have to do with the ways that the civic learning of the educational profession can be advanced by cooperation among faculty members in departments of the humanities and the social sciences, schools of education, schools of law, and schools of public administration and public affairs.

There obviously was not total agreement on all points, but there was

a remarkable consensus on the importance of the civic mission of education, and on a series of recommendations for promoting candid conversation and collaborative action. There was no manifesto drawn up ahead of time to be signed and endorsed; there was no hidden agenda, no political or educational party line. The group reflected a wide spectrum of political, social, and economic views, but these were never in the foreground of debate.

The Seminar also represented a wide spectrum of educational views and philosophies, and these were in the foreground, not so much as targets to be shot down, but as revealing the range of prevailing and historically persistent outlooks that need to be examined and dealt with much more thoroughly in both the short term and the long term ahead. Quick fixes by legislation and regulation were not viewed as the best avenues to fundamental educational reform. Yet it was agreed that some new organizational mechanisms are surely necessary if desirable changes are to be accomplished in any such unwieldy institution as American education.

We recognized that all kinds of institutions and agencies affect citizenship attitudes and behavior, but we chose deliberately to start with the colleges and universities as key ingredients in the reform of the schools, of the teaching profession—and of themselves. We noted that not only the lower schools and the schools of education are the subjects of current educational reform. Medical schools, law schools, business schools, journalism schools, graduate schools, and the undergraduate liberal arts colleges themselves are all targets of criticism, most often because they are not pursuing diligently enough the ethical, social, and public responsibilities of their educational mission. Soon after the Seminar was held, this was underscored by William J. Bennett's criticism of the humanities and the report of the Association of American Colleges urging a redefinition of the baccalaureate degree.

It is too early for the Seminar's list of recommendations to be put in order of priority, but my own impression is that two short-term and two long-term proposals were especially significant.

(1) It was urged that leading university presidents, individually and in consort, redouble their efforts to mobilize their several faculties of arts, sciences, education, and other professional schools to work together on the civic ingredients of teacher education. In speaking to the group, President Donald Kennedy of Stanford stressed the necessary linkage between public service and teacher education in a particularly persuasive way.

(2) It was proposed that pilot programs within individual institutions and coalitions among several institutions should be established at selected colleges and universities to try out various ways to bring the

scholarship and the expertise of faculties of humanities, social sciences, education, law, and other professional schools to bear on the civic learning of prospective and present teachers and administrators. These could be begun in fairly short order, if funding could be found to enable faculty time and effort to be devoted to them.

The longer term recommendations had to do with (3) research efforts, not only to evaluate new programs that might be instituted by the various innovative and collaborative efforts, but to bring to bear two decades of new research that has been already accumulated concerning the way civic values, attitudes, knowledge, and skills are developed among children, youth, and adults as a result of formal schooling and informal education. Such research has been forthcoming from scholars in the schools of education as well as those in the arts and sciences.

And, finally, (4) the long-term need to formulate a new and coherent conceptual framework regarding the meaning of citizenship in American life was viewed as especially fitting as we approach the bicentennial of the Constitution and Bill of Rights. We have little more than two years before the bicentennial of the Constitutional Convention, four years before the bicentennial of its adoption, and six years before the bicentennial of the Bill of Rights. These are short periods of time in which to develop a new conception of the civic mission of American education, one which Jefferson, Madison, Washington, and Adams might find congenial, but also one which would be efficacious for coming decades. And I can think of no more important investment that could be made by those foundations, academic and professional organizations, and agencies of the public and independent sector that are genuinely seeking to raise the quality of public life in America than to assist and join in this effort.

• • • •

R. Freeman Butts, a visiting scholar at the Hoover Institution for War, Revolution and Peace at Stanford University, Stanford, California, served as chairman of the Seminar on Civic Learning in the Education of the Teaching Profession, and prepared this introductory statement on behalf of the other Stanford University conveners of the seminar: Gerald A. Dorfman, senior fellow at the Hoover Institution; Paul R. Hanna, senior research fellow at the Hoover Institution; and Richard E. Gross, professor of education with the School of Education.

Co-Sponsors of the Seminar

The following associations, organizations, and institutions were co-sponsors of the Seminar on Civic Learning in the Education of the Teaching Profession held November 11-13, 1984, at the Hoover Institution on War, Revolution and Peace at Stanford University:

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education
American Educational Studies Association
Association of American Colleges
Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching
Hewlett Foundation
Hoover Institution on War, Revolution and Peace of Stanford University
Kettering Foundation
National Council for the Social Studies
National Endowment for the Humanities
Project '87 of the American Historical Association and the American Political Science Association
School of Education, Stanford University
Society of Professors of Education

Participants in the Seminar

Following are the individuals who participated in the Seminar on Civic Learning in the Education of the Teaching Profession held November 11-13 at the Hoover Institution on War, Revolution and Peace at Stanford University:

Bruce J. Anderson, Vice President, The Danforth Foundation, St. Louis, Missouri

J. Myron Atkin, Dean, School of Education, Stanford University, Stanford, California

Ayers Bagley, Professor, School of Education, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota, and President, Society of Professors of Education

James M. Banner, Jr., Council for Basic Education, Washington, D. C.

Kathryn M. Borman, Professor, College of Education, University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, Ohio, and President-Elect, American Educational Studies Association

Joe R. Burnett, Dean, College of Education, University of Illinois, Champaign, Illinois

Joan Burstyn, Professor, Douglass College, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, New Jersey

R. Freeman Butts, Visiting Scholar, Hoover Institution on War, Revolution and Peace, Stanford University, Stanford, California

Mervyn Cadwallader, President, Western New Mexico University, Silver City, New Mexico

Carlos E. Cortes, Chair, Department of History, University of California at Riverside, Riverside, California

Mark Curtis, President, Association of American Colleges, Washington, D. C.

Joseph de Vitis, Professor, Department of Secondary Education, University of Tennessee at Martin, Martin, Tennessee

Gerald A. Dorfman, Senior Fellow, Hoover Institution on War, Revolution and Peace, Stanford University, Stanford, California

Wayne Dumas, Professor, College of Education, University of Missouri, Columbia, Missouri, and Chairman, Committee on Teacher Education, National Council for the Social Studies

Thomas Dynesson, Professor, Department of Education, University of Texas at Odessa, Odessa, Texas, and Visiting Scholar, School of Education, Stanford University, Stanford, California

Diane U. Eisenberg, Executive Director, Council for the Advancement of Citizenship, Washington, D. C.

Barbara Finkelstein, Professor, Department of Education Policy, Planning, and Administration, and Director, Center for the Study of Education Policy and Human Values, College of Education, University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland

H. George Frederickson, President, Eastern Washington University, Cheney, Washington

C. Hugh Friedman, Professor, School of Law, University of San Diego, San Diego, California

James M. Giarelli, Professor, School of Education, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, New Jersey

Bernard Gifford, Dean, School of Education, University of California at Berkeley, Berkeley, California

Paula Gillette, School of Education, University of California at Berkeley, Berkeley, California

Richard E. Gross, Professor, School of Education, Stanford University, Stanford, California

John Hale, Program Officer, Division of Education Programs, National Endowment for the Humanities, Washington, D. C.

Paul R. Hanna, Senior Research Fellow, Hoover Institution on War, Revolution and Peace, Stanford University, Stanford, California

Jack Hoar, Supervisor of Social Studies, Long Beach Public Schools, Long Beach, California, and Chair, Committee on Citizenship, National Council for the Social Studies

Sidney Hook, Senior Research Fellow, Hoover Institution on War, Revolution and Peace, Stanford University, Stanford, California

Tom James, Instructor, School of Education, Stanford University, Stanford, California

John Jarolimek, Chairman, Task Force on Scope and Sequence in Social Studies, National Council for the Social Studies, Bothell, Washington

Alan H. Jones, Executive Editor, Prakken Publications, Inc., Ann Arbor, Michigan, and Secretary-Treasurer, Council of Learned Societies in Education

Faustine C. Jones-Wilson, Professor, School of Education, Howard University, Washington, D. C., and President, American Educational Studies Association

James Kelly, President, Spring Hill Foundation, Wayzata, Minnesota

Donald Kennedy, President, Stanford University, Stanford, California

Robert J. Kingston, Executive Director, Public Agenda Foundation, New York, New York

Michael W. Kirst, Professor, School of Education, Stanford University, Stanford, California

Christopher J. Lucas, Professor, College of Education, University of Missouri at Columbia, Columbia, Missouri

Sherry Magill, Wye Faculty Seminar, Washington College, Chestertown, Maryland

John Maguire, President, Claremont University Center and Graduate School, Claremont, California

Larry T. McGehee, Vice President for Development, Wofford College, Spartanburg, South Carolina

Suzanne Morse, Visiting Fellow, Kettering Foundation, Dayton, Ohio

Bernard Murchland, Professor, Department of Philosophy, Ohio Wesleyan University, Delaware, Ohio

Paul L. Murphy, Professor, Department of History, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota

William F. O'Neill, Professor, School of Education, University of

Southern California, Los Angeles, California, and Past President, American Educational Studies Association

Charles Park, Professor, School of Education, University of Wisconsin at Whitewater, Whitewater, Wisconsin

Charles N. Quigley, Executive Director, Center for Civic Education/Law in a Free Society, Calabasas, California 91302

Mary Anne Raywid, Professor, School of Education, Hofstra University, Hempstead, New York

Robert L. Saunders, Dean, College of Education, Memphis State University, Memphis, Tennessee, and President-Elect, American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education

John Anthony Scott, Professor of Law, Bronx, New York

James P. Shaver, Associate Dean for Research, College of Education, Utah State University, Logan, Utah

Peter A. Sola, Professor and Chair, Foundations of Education, School of Education, Howard University, Washington, D. C.

Irving J. Spitzberg, Jr., Executive Director, Council for the Improvement of Liberal Education, Association of American Colleges, Washington, D. C.

Verne Stadtman, Vice President for Special Services, The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, Princeton, New Jersey

Manfred Stanley, Director, Center for the Study of Citizenship, and Professor, Department of Sociology, Syracuse University, Syracuse, New York

John C. Syer, California State University-Sacramento, Sacramento, California

Charles A. Tesconi, Jr., Dean, College of Education and Social Services, University of Vermont, Burlington, Vermont

Judith Torney-Purta, Professor, Department of Human Development, College of Education, University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland

Francis T. Villemain, Professor, School of Education, San Jose State University, San Jose, California

Donald R. Warren, Professor and Chair, Department of Education Policy, Planning, and Administration, College of Education, University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland

Janice F. Weaver, Dean, College of Professional Studies, Glassboro State University, Glassboro, New Jersey, and President-Elect, Society of Professors of Education

First General Session: The Different Meanings of Civic Learning

The first general session of the Seminar on Civic Learning in the Education of the Teaching Profession was introduced by R. Freeman Butts and moderated by Mark Curtis.

The focus of the session was on two questions: What kinds of consensus are revealed in recent publications which seem hopeful for improving the civic learning of the teaching profession? What kinds of present disagreement in analysis or outlook can profitably be worked on to achieve improvement?

Papers addressing these questions were presented by Barbara Finkelstein and James M. Banner, Jr., followed by responses prepared by Bernard Murchland and Mary Anne Raywid.

Thinking Publicly about Civic Learning: An Agenda for Education Reform in the '80s

By Barbara Finkelstein

Unless we have lied to one another in public, we are involved in promoting civic learning because we share a common vision. Some would call it an illusion. It is a belief in the power of education to advance the pursuit of justice, dignity, compassion, love, and peace. We share a concern for the fate of freedom and justice in a world divided not only by religious, racial, national, ethnic, and sexual bigotries, but one in which the very capacity to imagine, and thus create, just, free, and dignifying social conditions appears to be diminishing.

John Dewey anticipated and described our problem and our mission in *The Public and Its Problems* in 1927. Our problem inheres in the fact that political forms constituted to protect freedom and dignity under one set of conditions may be inadequate to do so under another. When this happens, a state of moral confusion erupts. New groups form, but they do not become a public. Instead, they remain inchoate, unorganized, outside the margins of awareness. To form belief and consciousness, the group has to break existing political forms. This is hard to do because the forms are themselves the regular means of instituting change.

Our task, it seems to me, is one of intellectual midwifing: ministering to a promising but as yet unorganized "public-in-the-making." In simpler terms, our task is to reveal threats to freedom, dignity, and justice in the 1980s and constitute the civic educational visions required to identify and remove them. Our challenge is to find the vocabulary to do so.

Embedded in a variety of articles emerging in the 1980s is an implicit redefinition of civic education and the means to transmit it. As cacophonous and disparate as they appear to be, civic education reformers of this decade share some assumptions about the quality of public life and the means to secure it. There is an assumption that education and constitutional government represent the foundations on which liberty and justice stand. There is a view that moral and intellectual matters of learning are more important than technical ones. There is a notion that education can be recalled to its traditional civic mission if we fulfill three conditions: first, as intellectuals, we must account for the weakening of public consciousness and commitment; second, as educators, we must weave alterations into the fabric of allusion, fable, and sentiment being made available to teachers and students in schools; and, third, as education professionals, we must generate prescriptions for the transformation of teacher education.

When these common threads are disentangled and rewoven, they reveal the civic situation in education and illuminate paths of educational experience which might light our collective way. An implicit civic agenda calls for a reconceptualization of civic education—the better to transform it into a sensitive and effective weapon against contemporary assaults on freedom and dignity. Ultimately, it projects a vision of teachers as embodiments and instruments of civic learning. It identifies agendas for curriculum innovation ranging from simple exhortations to require the study of the Constitution to complex calls for new curricula, new definitions of professional socialization, and new forms of communication between teachers and learners.

What follows is an elaboration of the "ideological template," to borrow a concept from Clifford Geertz, being developed at this time for civic learning. It has three parts, each representing a different side of the reform effort. The first involves a redefinition of civic learning. The second specifies concrete proposals for reform. The third focuses on teacher education and education professionalism. When they are taken together, they constitute a means to nurture and deliver what those of us involved have variously called a "reconstructed republican spirit," "a disinterested civic consciousness," and a "civic covenant." I will be calling it a "reconstructed public spirit."

LB 25

The Search for Public Philosophy: Education and the Rediscovery of Civic Connections. The search for wholeness, the need for ideology, the quest for harmonizing visions and integrating educational structures is an important emphasis in the work of civic education reformers in this decade. Resonant perhaps with the injustices they see around them, with the nature of contemporary threats to freedom, justice, and dignity, and with the ethical and conceptual enormities of the task they have set for themselves, the spirit of civic education reform in the 1980s suffuses an almost militant moral assertiveness. Indeed, the celebration of moral agency, interdependence, and reciprocity is an indispensable part of the conceptual apparatus being used to unmask deficiencies in our understanding of civic bonds, and to construct a blueprint for the reconstruction of civic learning. An array of social critics has introduced a distinctive mode of social criticism and political analysis. They explore states of mind as well as structures of regulation. They analyze mental as well as material conditions and habits. They pay as much attention to structures of thought as to structures of government. Like the architects of civic education who preceded them, they are preoccupied with public philosophy, and seek to articulate its fundamental features. Unlike their predecessors, however, they look upon political philosophy as a form of civic educational agency, exploring its value as a moral and cognitive message system, judging it by its capacity to inspire just action in daily life.

Embedded in the work of social critics as distinct from one another as William Sullivan, Robert Bellah, Jane Roland Martin, Richard Harvey Brown, Manfred Stanley, Henry Giroux, C. H. Bowers, and Donald R. Warren, among others, is a devastating observation: that the language and symbols of modern political philosophy and sociology obscure rather than reveal the moral foundations of democratic politics. They impoverish the capacity to imagine new and liberating forms of civic affiliation. What is more, they inhibit constructive political thinking and action. Implicit in their argument is a view that intellectuals and politicians—those charged with the forging of new public visions—can initiate change only after they can conceptualize it.

Though I cannot in this brief essay do full justice to the quality and elegance of such formulation, these radical critics have rejected, as incorrect and mischievous, the central intellectual assumptions on which the concept and conduct of civic education have rested. First rejected is a concept of the civic individual conceived independently of social relationships, or in light of what some might call a socially ungrounded civic vision. Second is the traditional view that civic bonds arise not out of primary or primordial attachments and loyalties in home, church, and neighborhood, but exclusively from rationally calcu-

C. 326

lated associations among aggregates of individuals who, in pursuit of self interest, enter into exchange relationships, the better to secure social, economic, and intellectual advantage. Third, there is the view based upon an assumption that social solidarity, reciprocity, mutual aid, cooperation, and respect for human dignity can or should emerge out of contractual relationships or even individual moral decisions. Finally, there is an implicit definition of civic education as preparation in the art of calculating self interest, securing exchange relationships, and understanding the processes of government, the better to contain and direct the regulatory structures through which the "Public Will" can be expressed and realized.

These radical philosophical critics condemn the conceptual and ethical poverty of a civic philosophy which reveals the public only as an arena of competing consumers or clients or dependents or patients, requiring simply a fair distribution of goods, services, skills, or rationalities from government. They condemn a philosophy which conceives commitments to justice, freedom, and dignity only in material and paternal terms. They reveal the existence of a tradition where there is no way to conceive of civic bonds built on mutuality and interdependence, cooperation and harmony, sociability and love outside the public domain. Their critique calls not only for a reconstruction of public philosophy and educational structure, but an integrated vision of democratic citizenship as well. Brown, whose work and ideas are deeply embedded in my current analysis, has stated it with elegant simplicity: "Citizens are persons who act publicly as moral agents." In a just and friendly society, he implies, they are social beings who in their public roles reveal their character and commitments. As citizens, they practice moral agency. If the conditions of modern life prevent the social exercise of moral agency—if the poitical economy precludes it, government ceases to require it, education fails to model it—then freedom and justice are threatened. If people cannot, will not, or do not identify and socialize personal commitments in public action, if they sever connections between private valuing and public acting, then they cease to be citizens. They are transformed into cunning rationalists, or mere functionaries, no longer the protectors of justice, freedom, or dignity. As a moral matter, their commitments to freedom, justice, and dignity become either empty pieties, or worse, demagogic invocations of socially disconnected rhetoric.

There is a critique of liberal reason as well as vision embedded in the work of civic education reformers in this decade. As some see it, threats to the quality of public consciousness arise not only from socially-induced failures of moral vision, but from socially-constructed failures of moral reasoning as well. The critique of moral reasoning grows out

of the recognition that contemporary threats to the realization of freedom go beyond the tyrannies of kings and churches, aristocracies, oligarchies, and unruly, undisciplined, illiterate rabble. The tyrannies include intellectual despotisms being perpetrated in the name of science, rationality, efficiency, and organization.

Stanley has developed this critique with enormous insight in his 1981 volume *The Technological Conscience*. Put simply and instrumentally, he suggests that reason, through the transforming power of liberal political philosophy, became unglued from its roots in ethics and morals and became stuck instead in the bedrock of economic and political planning and development. Contemporary public thinking was thus nurtured on a conceptual bedrock from which symbolic as well as corporate and public monopolies could be built, and out of which competing languages would emerge. Public language would be the language of reason and rationality, of technique, organization, and planning. Private language would be the language of passion and spirit, of morality and affection. The visions of liberal political philosophers would detach the language of the spirit from public discourse. In so doing, they would banish imagination, spirit, wonder, and the unknown from public works. Their visions would substitute the language of rationality and technique. It is in these two conditions—moral myopia and rational domination—that the technocratic conscience resides and from which civic learning must be rescued.

There is yet another condition in liberal political philosophy from which visions of civic association must be rescued, if civic learning is to be creatively reconceptualized. It is a condition revealed most trenchantly among feminist critics as they attack a fundamental structural principle in modern liberal conceptions of social life—the division of social life into two different spheres, a natural one based on sentiment and biology, and an historical one based on convention and contract between individuals. The separation of private and public, particular and universal spheres has two unfortunate consequences. It defines public life as that which occurs outside small circles of association in family, church, and neighborhood. And it articulates a concept of civic life which excludes love, friendship, compassion, as appropriate organizing principles for public life. Through the transforming vision of political philosophy, small associations in public are nestled in the domain of the private. So, too, are relationships built on sentiment and sharing. The radical feminist vision is one calling for a vocabulary that can introduce the language of morality, love, and sentiment into public thinking, thus providing a means to reintegrate passion and power, intellect and emotion, sense and sensibility in our visions of civic possibility. This vision aims to return moral thinking to the public realm.

Consistent with these aims, civic education reformers of the 1980s are disposed to place the study and use of language on an equal footing with the study of history, constitutional forms, and electoral processes as they think about civic learning. Because they identify the capacity for manipulating language as indispensable moral and political equipment, they have placed what Bernard Murchland calls "an enabling language" at the center of a construction of civic learning.

Through the critique of liberal political philosophy and the discovery of symbolic imperialism, an array of critics has rediscovered relationships between politics, morality, language, and social change. They treat philosophy and ideology as texts to be explicated, analyzing them for logical consistency and ethical content. But they have done more. They have analyzed them as educational agencies, exploring their values as moral and cognitive message systems, and judging them by their capacity to inspire just action in daily life. By rediscovering relationships between politics, morality, and language, they aim to neutralize what Walter Lippmann in 1929 in his *A Preface to Morals* called "the acids of modernity," the division of public and private domains, the severing of the sacred and profane, the intellect and the emotions, theory and practice, thought and action.

Indeed, the search for a civic covenant grounded in morality rather than interest, interdependence rather than competition, mutuality and reciprocity rather than selfishness and privatism, represents an indispensable element in the attempt to redefine the substance of civic learning. It also provides a rationale, a standard, a point of view from which to stand and judge the quality of educational environments, curriculum materials, and pedagogical modes—and, at the same time, to engage in their reconstruction.

Redefining Civic Literacy. There is an implicit definition of citizenship in the thought of civic reformers of this decade. It is a vision of citizens as symbolizers and public associates as well as greedy and self-interested actors. They are people in need of meaningful public associations as well as civic entitlements. They are people who can master technique and meaning, or, as John Maguire suggests, "walk between two worlds." Competent citizens according to this view are persons in command of their symbolic worlds. They are people who understand and nurture public association, as well as comprehend democratic rights and entitlements.

Civic education for this sort of citizen requires the nurture of symbolic capacities and public commitments as well as political knowledge. It requires them to do more than study constitutions, bills of rights, legislative processes, election politics, or American history, indispensa-

ble as such topics are to the nurture of public consciousness and responsible citizenship.

Contemporary visions of civic learning are large. As James Giarelli demonstrates in his essay in the November/December 1983 issue of the *Journal of Teacher Education*: "... [civic education] involves preparation in the intellectual qualities which allow us to envision new possibilities for public life, [acquire] the social and moral qualities to resist domination and work with others in collective projects." Richard Morrill's vision, from the 1982 winter issue of *Liberal Education*, is equally large: "Education for democratic citizenship involves human capacities relating to judgment, to choice, and to action. To be literate as a citizen requires more than knowledge and information; it includes the exercise of personal responsibility, active participation, and personal commitment to a set of values. If we are serious about education for the exercise of the responsibilities of citizenship ... we need to approach [it] in a consistently interactive way, never losing sight of either knowledge and content on the one hand, or the dynamics of human empowerment on the other."

There are echoes of Thomas Jefferson, Jane Addams, John Dewey, and George Counts in this discourse. But there are new elements as well. Consistent with this vision is a disposition to place the study and use of language at the center of the civics curriculum, the better to enable citizens to integrate and overcome the determinacies of language and the intellectual and ideological impositions accompanying them. Indeed, there is an unparalleled sensitivity to the politics of knowledge and identity.

It is revealed in attempts to transform the fund of allusion, fable, and sentiment being made available in history books—introducing women, ethnic and racial minorities, children, and families, to be sure—and seeking through their inclusion to recover a more inclusive sense of national community. Seen in a different way, the transformation of American history represents an attempt to do away with the very special conceptual prisons that history can build. Michael Zuckerman describes it with characteristic perspicacity in the February 1984 issue of *The History Teacher* when he states that traditional histories, and the men who wrote them, have mired citizens exclusively "... in the lives, successive assumptions, and aspirations of a small cosmopolitan class. In doing so, they have entombed [the citizenry] ever more profoundly in the iron cage of modernity."

The entombment of the citizenry exclusively in the affairs of state has had yet another effect. It has sent a covert message to women, minorities, and other ordinary folks. The national community, the civic community, it reads, is an exclusive one, and for many an irrelevant one.

For public life is exclusively that of the voter, the worker, the manager, and the governor, not the lover, the nurturer, the moralist, or the spirited. Thus stripped of moral content, public processes become uninspiring as well as exclusive.

Socially grounded study of democratic political forms will make it possible to transform the formal language of justice and freedom into public conversation, and public association. So, too, will a careful explication of political classics like the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, the Federalist Papers, to pick popular favorites of R. Freeman Butts, Mortimer Adler, and Paul Murphy—Stanley adds work of certain modernization theorists, and I would include work of Charlotte Perkins Gilman and Hannah Arendt, as well as Dewey and Addams. What is important here is that works like these provide integrating visions of public association—jumping-off places from which to explore the dark and lighter sides of public thinking and public association and the quality of democratic life.

The call for "academical villages," "communities of names," prescribed curricula, law related education, and values education, as reviewed by Mervyn L. Cadwallader in the winter 1982 issue of *Liberal Education*, all represent attempts to provide integrated opportunities for students and teachers to explore public spirit and public thinking systematically, and in small social or public associations. Like all integrating opportunities, they are as laden with imperial possibilities as they are with enabling visions.

The challenge of civic education is to articulate harmonizing visions without imposing them. Responsible civic learning involves the discovery of integrating visions and structures and the demystification of them. It means the renewal of public communities and their destruction. It involves the worship of freedom, dignity, and justice, but not necessarily its particular or constructed public forms. Carlos Cortes in the November/December 1983 issue of the *Journal of Teacher Education* calls for the civilizing of the most powerful instrument of public influence yet discovered—television.

Re-Imagining Professional Education: The Cultivation of Teachers as Translators and Explorers. A revival of civic learning is dependent not only on the cultivation of civic vision and the discovery of civilizing educational forms and processes, but on a reconstruction of professional understanding as well. The task is awesome, because colleges of education, like other university domains, typically extend rather than correct the tendency to specialize and fragment. They embody and model the very processes which weaken public consciousness. And, in the process, they perpetuate them—preparing a generation of educa-

tors who, if they prepare competent citizens, will do so by accident.

The reconstruction of professional education requires an undoing of the technicist mentalities which have overcome the field, and which direct its purposes and processes. The technicist mentality in education can be understood as a moral and spiritual retreat, a withdrawal from universes of moral and intellectual discourse into the world of the education specialist where a language of utility dominates, and where knowledge is taken to be useful only insofar as it applies neatly to pedagogical situations between teachers and students in classrooms and counselors and clients in student personnel offices.

Drawing its dominant metaphors from business, corporations, and more recently from cybernetics and medicine, the technicist model of professionalism in education projects students as products, outputs, patients, or clients. It projects professors, administrators, and teachers as managers, inputs, specialists, or therapists. It projects educative institutions as factories, stores, systems, and clinics.

The technicist model of professional education appropriates the canons of experimental science as authoritative. It aims for predictability, reproducibility, the control of variabilities in the research it sponsors. It enshrines the quantifiable and the measurable.

Its mode of communication is the exclusive one of the specialist—a "knowledge producer" who speaks a language that no one understands, cultivates a jargon fit only for the initiated, and promises a science of education which, it is claimed, can provide an objective, neutral, rational, and authoritative guide for action in pedagogical situations.

A preference for technical over intellectual and moral matters of learning informs the technicist model of professionalism. The emphasis on technique is reflected in persistent efforts to infuse vocational and utilitarian offerings into the curriculum of public schools, and to view historical, philosophical, comparative, and social dimensions of education study as somehow peripheral, irrelevant, ornamental, useless, or, heaven help us, subjective. It is reflected in a love of testing and in the embracing of competency-based education. It diminishes the vision of literacy to include technical mastery and skill, rendering wisdom and judgment as desirable by-products.

Technicist models of professional education disjoin the adventure of education from intellectual, literary, and social adventuring, placing its practitioners at a distance from centers of inquiry, discourse, learning, and criticism that are available in universities, libraries, policy centers, and artistic circles. And it ill-prepares them to understand and engage in the hustle and bustle of educational politics—where options and possibilities are effectively created.

Professional education, as currently practiced in universities, is the

very embodiment of positivism, and its attendant moral myopias. Much the same could be said for myriad of other specialized units in the contemporary university—including those in liberal arts departments. But in colleges of education, where future teachers reside, a diminished vision reverberates from one generation to the next as narrow-minded teachers go out and cultivate narrow-minded educational situations, and in predictable fashion reproduce another generation of technique worshippers.

The crisis in professional education inheres exactly in our reigning preference for technique, and our unwillingness to admit questions of purpose and morality into the study and practice of professional education. In the final analysis, a retreat to technique can only be understood as a retreat into privatism and exclusivity. It represents a public leave-taking, as though professional educators have given up on social reconstruction and moral nurture.

There is an alternative vision of teacher preparation in the making. It is one which reveals and extends the template of experience being contemplated and developed in our discussions of civic learning. It involves the view of educators as translators and explorers—people who, because they have experienced multiple realities, can speak in several tongues. The vision of educators as explorers and translators civilizes teacher preparation. It transforms it from a profession training knowledge producers and skill builders into one creating civic educators, self-conscious participants, observers and interpreters of educational purposes, practices, and arrangements who as they do their work discover and re-create new public forms.

The preparation of educators as translators involves the cultivation and mastery of multiple languages—the languages of technique and imagination, of utility and spirit, of politics and poetics. It includes the language of children and youth and of their heroes and heroines—rock stars, athletes, electronic characters. The language of politics, of the street, and of other cultures are no less necessary.

The preparation of educators as translators also involves the systematic cultivation of educative consciousness and sensibility. Teachers must learn how words and ideals operate in public, how thoughts and ideas become transformed into political structures and action, how intellect and politics intersect. They must know how the force of political and economic circumstance is transformed into attempts to persuade and to resist domination. They should engage, as Stanley suggests in the November/December 1983 issue of the *Journal of Teacher Education*, "... in a broad integral, aggressive, and scholarly examination of how the whole structure of existing education already embodies and broadcasts multiple models of the social world and

associated conceptions of civic values."

The preparation of educators as discoverers and translators leads them to discover the ways in which human beings come to know who they are, how they ought to believe, how they might behave, what they mean by the words they use and the things they do. In short, it leads to the discovery of connections between education and public identity.

The preparation of teachers as translators involves no withdrawals —either from the rigors and elegance of traditional academia, or the bustle and turbulence of life in classrooms, homes, museums, and amphitheaters. It subscribes to no single professional theology, no single-discipline perspective. It requires teachers-in-preparation to breach the walls of the disciplines, the better to tear them down, and transform them.

As discoverers and translators, professional educators also serve as mediators, and sometimes even, as Douglas Sloan suggests, writing in the spring 1982 issue of *Teachers College Record*, as witnesses. They bridge the world of the university and the many publics its serves. The teacher as translator is simultaneously, inherently, necessarily, an architect and bridge builder—discovering, designing, and forging links between otherwise uncommunicative agencies: scholars and practitioners, philosophers and politicians, liberal artists and educators, scientists and poets, textbook writers and professors, teachers and their students, to name but a few. As discoverers and translators, teachers continually re-create communities, linking otherwise unassociated individuals and groups into communities cultivating and engaging in civic conversation and association.

The preparation of teachers as translators requires the cultivation of a professional community respectful of many ways of knowing, doing, and being. It enables teachers to take the best of what is scientifically derived, philosophically understood, historically recovered, symbolically represented, politically motivated, and civilize it. The vision of teachers and translators constitutes a program of professional preparation requiring teachers to discover and reconcile fragmenting public identities, while at the same time arming them with the wherewithal to engage students in similar processes.

The vision of teachers as translators calls for teacher preparation programs that intrude teachers into multiple communities of inquiry, professional cultures, and educational settings. It situates them among diverse social critics and public philosophers. Because the activities in which they engage awaken rather than obstruct the emergence of new forms of community, the preparation of teachers as translators constitutes the essence of civic learning.

Professional preparation done with this in mind will engage

educators-to-be in academic study of the hardest kind, but in social context and civic communion as well. They need to study the practice of public educational agency by all "captains of consciousness"—television moguls, parents, museum directors, public planners, as well as teachers and other education professionals. They need to study public association in schools, to be sure, but also in smaller circles of association as well—in families, churches, neighborhoods, theaters, and amphitheaters, where, as David Mathews has observed, public commitments originate.

Teachers in preparation as translators and explorers need to examine education ideologies as forms of public education as well as philosophies. They would examine professional culture not only to join themselves in public association for political purposes, but to become critical and aware of social, intellectual, and political origins of their organized association. They need to study, not worship, the social and moral basis for their expertise. Teachers in preparation as discoverers and translators would also master more than one way of knowing and doing, learning the structures of more than a discipline, at least commanding two symbolic systems, the better to recognize their limitations and possibilities.

They will study in classrooms and on the streets, among liberal artists and professional scientists. They will study television and philosophy. They need mentors and models and they need to have them available informally as well as in class.

If we organize teacher education in a civic manner, we will feel some responsibility for helping students integrate the diverse experience of professional preparation. We will begin to work together—across disciplines, across social worlds, across professional walls and fields. We will work with our students and not at them. This represents the essence of creativity in education and the core of civic learning.

• • • •

Barbara Finkelstein is a professor in the Department of Education Policy, Planning, and Administration, and director of the Center for the Study of Education Policy and Human Values, College of Education, University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland.

Thinking about Civic Education

By James M. Banner, Jr.

> "Before I give you the benefit of my remarks, I'd like to know what we're talking about."
>
> —Michigan legislator

There may be equally important curricular problems in the United States, but I know of none more compelling than that of civic education and the preparation of teachers to offer it. I also know of no more difficult problem, or one to which more heat has been applied than light. Civic education threatens to become to the curriculum what the Democratic Party among our political institutions and the public schools among our social organizations have already become: the vessel that bears all of our expectations and that, bearing them, shatters. If we can do nothing else, we must be practical while dreaming, self-denying while ardent, above all proportionate where we are inclined to be unbounded. If we can discipline ourselves, we will have already taken large steps toward solving some of the predicaments that face us, most of them of our own making. What are the most important of these?

Civic education now carries so many definitions that it has no useful

meaning. Equal in number to the definitions are the proposals as to what should be sought under the covering term. Thus we are told that the ends of civic education are to achieve consensus, to instill values, to teach the obligations of citizenship, to meet the challenges of technology and the media, to create public virtue, and to remove the barriers of gender and race. Not surprisingly, these proposals often originate with those who would benefit from them or with those who have an occupational interest in their adoption. Historians and philosophers recur to the great texts of our heritage. Social scientists wish to confront technology. Women and members of racial and ethnic minorities look to civic education to help banish discrimination.

Each one of these is a worthy end, and some of them are essential to the civic health and integrity of the United States. Yet these are also separate arguments orginating in a separate interest society. They cannot all sweep the field. Chances are that they will checkmate with each other. And the discussion will then be stalemated, too. Particularism, ideology, and fragment concerns will carry the day. That must not happen.

In the second place, the need for civic education is attributed to so many problems, the failure of civic education blamed for so many ills, and the crisis of the public sphere taken to be so dire that civic education threatens to become an anticipated cure-all for the nation's social and cultural defects. We are told that the decline in voter participation and the contempt in which public authority is said to be held originated in incompetence in the classroom. The purported reduction of attachment to the Bill of Rights is laid at the doors of the schools. Those of the conservative Right ascribe social disorder to teachers' relativistic view of civic standards. The liberal Left inculpates an emphasis upon obligation rather than upon process in instruction for what it perceives to be the shortcomings of public policy. In this cacophony of charges, assumption replaces evidence and frustration pays a tribute to uncertainty. The very range of the fears expressed and of the solutions proposed reveals more about us than about the problem itself and suggests a major failure of judgment on our part.

Finally, reflections about civic education are striking by the absence among them of what everyone would recognize to be straightforward curricular thinking. Perhaps just as well. For if the many injunctions for change were accepted without qualification or accommodation, what we know as the standard liberal arts curriculum in the schools and colleges, or what is left of it, would have to be jettisoned in favor of a thorough-going, new-fangled program of civic learning. That is neither what we should wish nor what we should have.

None of those who urge upon us the reassertion of civic themes in

education offer any guidance as to how these themes would be reinstated in the course of instruction. I would not venture to instruct those more expert and experienced than I about the methods to be used in curricular change or about the many obstacles to them. Yet is it responsible to issue calls for change without proposing how change might come about—change in both the preparation of teachers and the schooling of our children?

Most writings on civic education are unanimous in their silence about curricular structure and adaptation. No one, to my knowledge, has considered how we advance from the current state of education purportedly without civic education to one embodying civic learning; by what purpose and with what means of suasion we should move the many people who influence American education to share our convictions; and in what way we shall commence to prepare the teachers of our youths to offer instruction in a subject of which we seem to agree they themselves are ignorant.

All of this is to say that, as well-intentioned as the recent debate about civic education has been, taken as a whole it lacks clarity, shared intention, and concreteness. What can be done?

First, we must parse the problem, break its elements out. To do that, we would best start with what I understand to be the general propositions before us—propositions that give the debate whatever elements of consensus it has gained. They are as follows:

The civic knowledge and participation of Americans has declined to levels that endanger the integrity of the republic and the strength of American society. Much of the responsibility for this parlous condition arises from failures of American institutions of education, which have relinquished their historic function of preparing young people for citizenship and acculturating them to the world as it is and may be. Therefore, the nation's schools and colleges should rededicate themselves to instruction and reflection about citizenship. This will best be accomplished by additions to the curriculum of .... And there the argument ends.

Behind these propositions lie some heavily-freighted assumptions. Unrecognized or unacknowledged, they govern our discussions. The principal ones are these: There is a classic standard and a golden age from which we have strayed. The standard itself should be retained. The promotion of its application will arrest and reverse the decline of citizenship. The standard should be inculcated in the schools and colleges, where it held a lofty position in the past. Teachers, rightly prepared, hold in their hands the power to reinvigorate civic life.

These assumptions are, in varying degrees, highly suspect. Some, open to the test of empirical substantiation, have not been subjected to

scrutiny. Others originate in unsupportable views of American society and its institutions. All cry out for verification. At the moment, they don't have it.

Let me commence with history. We recur, when we despair of the present, to some imagined age of sweetness and light in the past. For us, it is the age of the American Enlightenment and its most versatile, celebrated, and captivating figure, Thomas Jefferson. From him, we received what has been the sovereign axiom of our civic existence: that an unlettered citizen is a contradiction in terms. And surely it is. But Jefferson didn't look to the schools to teach "civic education." He believed that the way to train up a nation of republican citizens was to educate them to the capacity to be well-informed. Then, well-informed, their collective judgment would not err. In Jefferson's time, however, many—most!—were denied even a modest bounty of education—which is to say that few had access to continuous schooling and that those who did were not directly schooled in civics.

Moreover, none to my knowledge assumed or proposed—in fact, not even well into this century, when schools accepted a much greater assimilating role, did they assume or propose—that schools would alone bear the responsibility to provide an education in civic values. The family, the church, the community: each was taken to be a partner coequal with schools in the moral and civic education of youths. The civic catechism was also clear, in large part because it was imbedded in a culture comparatively more ordered and homogeneous than ours.

We must therefore disenthrall ourselves of much—though certainly not all—of the past. Its ways are not those to which most of us would return. Its circumstances differed so radically from our own as to make its prescriptions generally inapplicable now. If we have lost some of the innocent certainty, we should have gained a knowing agnosticism that beckons us—here, in true Jeffersonian spirit—to chart our own course.

To do so, we should be of Jefferson's faith but also sure in our knowledge, modern in our means, and modest in our acts and hopes.

To begin with, we must acknowledge what we do not know; we must seek to know it; and we must be responsible in the use of this knowledge once gained. In other words, we must undertake some research and study, make its results known, and teach it to our aspiring and experienced teachers. This is, in effect, a research agenda for the community of American scholars.

We should learn, first of all, what is known and not known about the civic values held by Americans. Some of that data is available, based upon many sample surveys undertaken by polling organizations. Some of this information is sequential, at least since the 1960s. Much, however, is data based upon questions of immediate concern to the public

("How do you think government is working?"), of concern to the group paying for the poll ("If you voted for the Democratic presidential candidate, did you also vote for the Democratic congressional candidate?"), or of concern to political scientists ("Have you registered to vote?"). That is to say, many of these surveys concern political issues alone and can be taken only as proxies for surveys of civic values and knowledge. Some polls contain evidence on more general views of government; some provide information about knowledge of "social studies" subjects. None direct their attention to assessing changing civic values over time.

Those people concerned with the state of civic education should evaluate and seek to extract from such polling and related survey data whatever insights can be gained from them. In addition, they should attempt to have designed and carried out surveys that more directly relate to civic values and attitudes.

A source of empirical knowledge about what civic values are taught to Americans must also be developed. Little seems to be known, for instance, about the values imparted by social studies texts and by teachers of social studies and civics. Such analyses of texts in other fields have been undertaken and have been used to revise older approaches and to create new ones. Behind these efforts is the conviction that knowledge is a fundamental prop of reform. We should be guided by the same faith.

In addition to research, we must think hard and practically about how we will teach civic education. Though all proposed reforms in education commence in exhortation, they must finish in curricula. Yet little thought has been given to where education is to find a place in the school day or college term, on the lesson plan or course syllabus. Under what guidelines should the introduction or reinstatement of civic learning in the curriculum proceed?

I believe it essential that this segment of the discussion be governed by some fundamental commandments. I nominate two. First, Thou shalt not drop any subjects of the basic arts and sciences program from the curriculum in order to make way for civic education. Second, Thou shalt expect all teachers to accept the responsibility to offer instruction in the civic dimensions and implications of their subject. That is to say, There shalt not be separate courses in civic education.

That is one of the great challenges before us today: how to keep civic education from becoming just another specialty or vogue of an already over-specialized and fashionable curriculum, manifested in just another set of mandated lesson plans placed upon the shoulders of the social studies departments. The issue instead is how to have civic instruction permeate the curriculum throughout, how to have civic education

offered "across the curriculum." There is no privileged course, department, or profession in which civic education should be lodged.

This requires that civic education be more than teaching about the structure of county government or how the system of justice works. It requires that it be a subject as fitting for the sciences as for the history classroom, that it concern the responsibilities of experts as well as of the citizens who assess experts' judgment, that it raise issues of the tensions and conflicts between the claims of truth and knowledge and those of human welfare. This is genuine civic education, and it must span the entire school.

These are some of the considerations that the discussions of civic education have so far lacked. Their discussion can be avoided only at the cost of knowledge advanced and youths educated. Yet these issues do not reach to the fundamental conundrum of civic education in this democratic republic: how to reconcile the values of individual integrity and of mutual purpose. Or, if these values—each so strong in our history—cannot be reconciled, how the tension between them can be made vital and enlivening.

There may be no solution to this puzzle, but addressing it lies at the heart of both civic education and teacher training. Here, the utmost of good faith and trust—that is, of professionalism—lies at the heart of the matter. I wonder if we are up to it.

We pose this conundrum in different ways: the common weal *vs.* personal liberty, the community *vs.* the individual, obligations *vs.* rights. Each enshrines a vision of the civic good. One is quickened by the ideal of an organic society, each of whose members sacrifices desires and opportunities for the collective welfare of all. The other is animated by the end of independent people whose bonds create a society that promotes the realization of the good of each. These visions long antedate the peopling of this continent, and they are not to be married by the likes of us. Yet any kind of instruction in civic knowledge that ignores the tension or that values one more highly than another is not worthy to be called civic education.

Nevertheless, the need to address the tension, to accept it, and to teach about it both to students and to those who will teach them runs up against formidable obstacles. The political and social corollaries of each vision are plain for all to see; and just as the hope of establishing the victory of one over the other inflames passions on all sides, so no quarter is shown in the contest for the minds of youths. In preservation of their own responsibilities amidst such ideological conflict, teachers themselves usually retreat into an arid neutrality and offer only the most desiccated fare of civics in the classroom, when they offer any at all.

Worst of all, those teacher who would gladly learn and gladly teach their subjects are far from having the professional standing to do so. Unless teaching is raised from an occupation to a true profession, we shall not see substantial progress in any kind of civic education. That is to say, the promotion of civic education is dependent upon the professionalization of teaching.

This is a tall order, yet it is not meant as an invitation to despair. For how can we speak of the education of our future teachers in the civic arts without giving them authority to teach those arts? How are we to ask them to teach of citizenship without allowing them to embody their words in their acts? Much of the discussion of civic education today is fueled by the illusion that, once we decide what is best to do, the best will be done. But that is not so. To teach of the rights and obligations of citizenship in a nation like ours is the most sensitive and important responsibility that a teacher must discharge. All of our discussions are wasted if we do not face up to that fact.

Yet these responsibilities cannot be met unless teachers are given control of their own work; unless they are trusted with setting and policing their own standards; unless they are encouraged to learn and know as well as to practice; and unless they are led to think of themselves, and come to think of themselves, as knowledgeable and skilled experts—that is to say, unless they become professionals. I do not know how we can succeed in having teachers give instruction in the civic arts and encourage the discussion of citizens' roles unless we give them control of their own work.

There lie behind my convictions about the furtherance of our shared concerns some general principles—principles which I believe should govern all discussions of civic education. They arise from my belief that progress toward the improvement of civic education will commence only when we are clear-eyed and when we are practical.

We must, for example, be humble. Despite the expectations placed upon schooling, neither schools nor teachers exist in an institutional vacuum. Other institutions, other forces bear in values upon our fellow-citizens, and the work of schools and their faculties are but one element among many that effect our civic culture. The difference that we may make will be modest, and no amount of debate or planning will ensure the consequences we seek or stave off their unanticipated or undesirable side-effects.

Surely, too, no amount of talk will take the place of action or exemplification. We must try many things, but above all we must try something. And none of our acts, either of instruction or of teacher education, will be so important as bearing ourselves, not as ideologues, not as interested parties, not as those of a single issue, but as examples

of active citizens, extending ourselves for the good of the community.

As we do so, we must also be candid about the conditions native to civic education in this country—conditions that may not be reconcilable and that we must therefore bear with good will toward all. One is the tension between schooling as the arm of public authority and schooling as the catalyst and liberation of human potential. Often these two conflict, and I see no justification in hiding the conflict from ourselves, from our students, or from the communities we serve. A forthright acceptance and address of the issue, and a search for equilibrium between the forces of order and of change, of the public good and individual good, will be both honest and invigorating.

An equally important "given" of our circumstances is the tension between education for civic good and education for knowledge itself. It is not, as some would have it, a dichotomy between education as a public good and education as a means to private fulfillment or gain. It is rather that some knowledge cannot be reduced to civic knowledge, that some knowledge, rather than being private, is knowledge without end and becomes purposeful only in the surprise of its use. We must not try to reduce all schooling to civic schooling.

Finally, we must above all try to locate and embrace the general interest. Special pleading, reductionist argument, expansionist claims, warnings of peril: none will attract the support of our fellow-citizens. The history and meaning of the word "civic" connotes attachment, association, and universality—distinct from the word "political," which connotes exclusion and locality. Fidelity to the ideal of the civic requires us not simply to seek the inclusion of all, not simply to require and respect equal access for all views, but most of all to assist others to learn to act out of the general good as they see it, not out of insular absorption in a single perspective. If that is a utopian vision, so be it. That vision must be the engine of our words and acts.

• • • •

James M. Banner, Jr., is senior research associate at the Council for Basic Education, Washington, D. C.

Civic Education: Parsing the Problem

By Bernard Murchland

When George Kennan was ambassador to the Soviet Union, General Marshall advised him: "Don't fight the problem." This Kennan interpreted to mean: "Don't fight against the problem as a whole, for it includes elements that you cannot hope to change. Find out what elements, if any, are susceptible to your influence, and concentrate on them."

In an analogous vein, James M. Banner, Jr., advises us to parse the problem of civic education. Good advice. Rather than spending our efforts seeking the solution we should become clearer about what the problem is. We seem to be agreed on some such general description of it as this: We no longer have a common public philosophy as the basis of civic education. We are witnessing what Jürgen Habermas calls the disintegration of the public sphere—that realm of social life which resides beyond the private and before the strictly political. That sphere is where problems of common interest can be discussed with a maximum degree of maturity, rationality, and freedom. This is the sphere of what Habermas calls "free speech and discursive will formation."

A strong strain of the American tradition has always prized this

sense of the public. We trace it to Jefferson: Tocqueville lauded it; John Dewey captured its spirit when he wrote: "I am inclined to believe that the heart and final guarantee of democracy is in free gatherings of neighbors on the street corner to discuss back and forth what is read in uncensored news of the day and in gatherings of friends in the living rooms of houses and apartments to converse freely with one another."

This notion of the public—and the philosophic base upon which it rests—implied a certain consensus about individual freedoms and rights, the common good, and the nature of government. It implied, I might say, a certain conception of intelligence. Banner raises the question of how we shall teach civic education and regrets that the debate gives too little attention to what kind of curriculum civic education requires. I submit that it is premature to be worrying about the curriculum, important as that is. Civic education has not so much to do with a kind of curriculum as with a kind of intelligence. It is an epistemological question of how intelligence functions when we teach (or learn) civicly. Banner is right to say that civic education is not a matter of special courses devoted to that subject; he is also right to say that civic education should permeate the curriculum throughout. But he doesn't quite get to the question of what kind of intelligence must inspire such a curriculum, the question of the quality of rationality required.

Let me borrow some distinctions from David Mathews to clarify this point. We can distinguish, says Mathews, four kinds of intelligence. The first basic use of intelligence is to amass facts and gather information. But raw data in themselves are not very useful. What is required is a second kind of intelligence to assign meaning to them. Apples falling are observable, but when Newton subsumed this phenomenon to the law of gravity he gave it theoretical significance. Facts are meaningless until there is a theory to support them. To theorize is to see—to see parts in relationship to wholes.

Theory leads beyond itself to a higher level of creativity. It empowers us to invent, to innovate, to imagine new worlds. This might be considered a third level of intelligence. It is operative in all great creations, at those crucial junctures of human evolution when theories are powerfully wedded to empirical realities. To take an example, Einstein authored the theory of relativity, but it took a group of technologically oriented scientists to create the atomic bomb, which, whatever else we want to say about it, is a powerful technology representing a high order of creativity.

Consider another level of intelligence. The uses we have so far considered have in common that they are essentially private: an individual can know facts, an individual can theorize, an individual can create. But there is a fourth kind of intelligence that involves a special

kind of creativity: it is we thinking together. This is the essential mark of civic intelligence, and its purpose is the creation of publics. In this context we can speak of public truth and public knowledge. We can think of the public as an active agent of its own creation and not just a passive entity. The public creates what only a public can: itself. Sound public philosophies and good public practices are among the highest creations we are capable of. That is why history is important: it presents us with models of realized civic intelligence, examples of how other peoples in other times thought together to build communities of cities, states, and nations.

Let me say here that just as there is no special curriculum through which this intelligence is exercised, so there is no privileged profession in whom it is lodged. Teachers and educators of teachers acquire civic intelligence in the same way anyone else does; they are inducted into civic life, as Tom Green puts it, by becoming part of an "inclusive we." As a matter of fact teachers may have a minor role in the formation of public intelligence. Speaking as a liberal arts educator I should be happy if we could succeed in developing civic literacy; that is, if we could get students to think straight and talk well about our common interests. Civic literacy is an important building block of civic education, a necessary if not sufficient condition.

When we ask why we are not very good at this kind of thinking, we turn to Barbara Finkelstein's excellent analysis for some answers. It is because, she says, we have in large measure lost the sense of citizenship as moral agency. Liberal political philosophy has degenerated into the technocratic mentality, and it is from this that civic learning must be rescued. Let me note parenthetically that there is a tendency in much of the literature to lay too much blame for our predicament to liberal political philosophy, to impute to it possessive individualism, social atomism, and the like. One of the sharp features of the contemporary intellectual scene is an unrelenting attack upon liberalism from both the left and the right. I think there are dangers in this critique, for whatever the limitations of the liberal tradition, it is a most powerful ally for those trying to reconstruct a viable sense of the public.

But I digress from Finkelstein's main point: to wit, intelligence has been narrowed to mean technicist intelligence, and this has devastating consequences for education and the education of educators. The dominant philosophy of our culture is what Daniel Yankelovich calls the "missiles and money" reality sense. The principal reason why we are not coping with the many complexities we face, and why we are especially not doing very well in developing civic intelligence, is because of this defective philosophy.

Political and moral questions cannot be reduced to technical ones.

This is an insight as old as the Greeks. Yet we have lost sight of it. As Yankelovich puts it: "The process of technicalizing political issues renders them inaccessible to public understanding and judgment, because the public exists in the very domain that is excluded. To narrow issues artificially is to exclude the bulk of the citizenry from the policy shaping process."

Whatever the solution to this problem turns out to be, the reconstruction of public philosophy must begin by revitalizing the dialogic tradition: we must learn to talk to one another in a common tongue about common interests. Public philosophy is concerned with *res publica*, with the public's business. It is no accident that Socrates invented the dialogic method in philosophy at a time when the Greeks were experiencing the first flush of democracy. The dialogic method is the democratic way of arriving at public truth. Plato may not have thought highly of democracy, but Socrates did. His abiding conviction was that the public was created through dialogue, or what in a more modern idiom Habermas calls the praxis of communicative action—that is, through language that leads to public building action. Public in the strong sense means knowing and doing well; above all, it means knowing and doing in common what we never can alone.

• • • •

Bernard Murchland is with the Department of Philosophy at Ohio Wesleyan University, Delaware, Ohio.

Comparisons on Civic Education

By Mary Anne Raywid

I find this an interesting pair of approaches. Considering them side by side brings added appropriateness to James M. Banner, Jr.'s opening quotation: "Before I give you the benefit of my remarks, I'd like to know what we're talking about." It seems clear to me that in large measure these two statements speak to different topics. Interestingly, much that Banner apparently takes as the givens in the situation is precisely what Barbara Finkelstein sees at issue. They are agreed, it seems, that teachers must be professionals and that their preparation must accord with such a purpose. Beyond that, we have surely been spared much hint of redundancy.

For Banner, the launching pad for improving civic education seems to be built of the following assumptions: First, there is a danger that civic education—whatever it may be—threatens to become all-embracing in intent, and pretentious in its expectations. Second, needed empirical research into the civic values of Americans should yield the civic values to be taught the young. Third, questions about civic learning reduce to curricular questions. Fourth, the necessary civic learning should be inserted into all the courses where it has relevance; it does not

demand separate courses. Fifth, "the fundamental conundrum of civic education ... [is] ... how to reconcile the values of individual integrity and of mutual purpose." And sixth, there is a permanent irreconcilability between the school's roles as "the arm of public authority" on the one hand and as "the catalyst and liberation of human potential" on the other—and this conflict is best met with "forthright acceptance" and the search for equilibrium.

Finkelstein, on the other hand, is perhaps less worried that our efforts will be overblown than that they will prove insufficient to the task. She suggests that she would find a sampling of Americans' civic values—even a very valid and reliable sample—inadequate to content determination for civic education. The literature she cites makes a convincing case that civic education is much more than curriculum-determined instruction. Moreover, she urges an approach that will require direct and sustained teaching, in supplement of treating civic values as they arise throughout the curriculum. And perhaps most fundamentally, she finds the challenge of the content of the civic learning needed for today far more problematic than Banner's "fundamental conundrum"—the tension between the individual and the group. This is not to suggest that Banner's conundrum is simple or artificial. It is, of course, the enduring tension of democratic theory. But Banner focuses on the logical paradoxes that have always been with us. Finkelstein is preoccupied with the context-specific demands of our time. The reason for this difference is, I suspect, that Banner's is primarily a transmission conception of education; Finkelstein's is more explicitly oriented toward the present and future.

These, then, appear to me to be the major contrasts in orientation which yielded two such very different approaches with which to begin our thinking. There is one further contrast that may also lie close to the center of these differences, although it nowhere quite surfaces: I suspect Finkelstein is part of, and would willingly associate herself with, the social studies tradition, and with social studies classes as the instructional center of civic education. Banner gives no sign of acceptance of that tradition—and indeed, one even finds a contra-indication or two in his fundamental commandments retaining the arts and sciences in the curriculum and his rejection of separate civic education courses.

I find Finkelstein's orientation much closer to my own. I think our readings of the sorest challenges of our times are more similar. I share her emphasis on the impossibility of identifying a public. The single-interest groups into which we have fragmented are but the most extreme and visible evidence of the absence of an acknowledged public philosophy. And the preoccupation with engineering concerns—to the exclusion or subordination of those which are not—suggests that the

orientation now serving many as a world view can hardly stand as a viable public philosophy.

I agree with Finkelstein, too, that the school's purpose must simultaneously be to cultivate individual liberty and authority, as well as a shared public philosophy. Surely in this she aligns herself with the traditional view of what a liberal education is about, and accepts its central liberating mission. She incorporates what has been perhaps the major contribution of the twentieth century to illuminating that mission—namely, the idea that education must focus explicitly on helping the young to learn how to think and to critically examine the world and its possibilities. I believe she is correct in identifying an expanding consensus on updating that mission for our time.

As originally formulated by John Dewey and elaborated by others, children must be taught to think carefully or critically if they would be free and in a position to direct their own lives intelligently. Today's preoccupation with that challenge, and the most persuasive response to it, comes from sociology of knowledge. It is concepts drawn from that field which with greatest clarity and insight delineate the present challenge of achieving genuine autonomy and freedom of thought; and it is strategies recommended by sociologists of knowledge that appear our most advanced evolution in meeting that challenge. What we must try to develop is what C. A. Bowers has called "cultural literacy": "the ability to read or decode the taken-for-granted assumptions and conceptual categories that underlie the individual's world of experience." Or, as formulated by Jürgen Habermas, what is needed is "communicative competence"—i.e., the ability "to negotiate meanings and purposes instead of passively accepting the social realities defined by others."

Perhaps my main quarrel with Finkelstein lies in what I find insufficient attention to the non-cognitive and non-instructed dimensions of today's civic education. She acknowledges that "to be literate as a citizen requires more than knowledge ... [it involves] ... the exercise of personal responsibility, active participation, and personal commitment to a set of values." But she fails to address how these aspects of literacy are cultivated. I am convinced that in considerable measure it has to do with a set of environing conditions—with the kind of norms which organizations and institutions reflect, the sort of behavior modelled within them, the roles actors are invited to assume, and the nature, extent, and direction of the bonding thus generated.

I think Banner is correct in reminding us that we must "disenthrall ourselves of much of the past" since "its circumstances differed so radically from our own as to make its prescriptions generally inapplicable now." The difference of greatest significance is not, in my judgment, that schools are teaching less. In fact, I can remember how appalled I

was at youthful distortions of the Constitution reported by the Purdue Opinion Polls in the 1950s, when I began teaching—and those are what are now referred to as "the good old days."

What has changed enormously, though, is the life worlds of those we are trying to educate. Claude Brown pinpointed the upshot of such changes when he recently returned to the Harlem ghetto in which he struggled to grow up, and which he portrayed in his memorable *Manchild in the Promised Land*. In contrast to his own boyhood friends of 20 years ago, Brown finds today's manchild "more knowledgeable, more amicable—and more likely to commit murder." Indeed, he discovered that "murder is in style now." It is done quite casually and gratuitiously. Such total indifference to other human beings has to be predicated on a total lack of identity with them, the absence of any sense of relatedness or connection or fellow-feeling. It is quite different sentiments—and the environing conditions which generate and sustain them—which are necessary ingredients in the only kind of civic education which makes sense to me. I find it hard to celebrate as civic education even impressive displays of relevant propositional knowledge in the absence of a sense of social responsibility and a lived commitment to moral values. But if the necessary environing conditions no longer obtain, that means we must either lower our sights or try to provide those conditions within schools. In my judgment there is no choice but to attempt the latter. That is why I am more afraid our aims will be too modest than that they will be too grand. Grand they may be, if that is what it takes. It would strike me as odd to celebrate even a perfect score on the Bill of Rights exam for Harlem's manchild, if he remains prone to obliterating those rights for others at gunpoint.

Quite a lot has been learned about how schools can supply the necessary conditions—with sufficient success even to reclaim Harlem's men- and womenchildren. Similarly, recent study of effective public alternative schools as well as of private schools has shed considerable light on the school conditions that contribute importantly to the affective and valuational dimensions of civic education that I have been emphasizing. I am hoping to see more stress on these dimensions in subsequent discussions of civic education.

Meanwhile, I must note that so far little direct heed has been paid to the preparation of teachers for the civic education task. Banner and Finkelstein, as well as myself, have focused more on identifying civic education than on preparing teachers to undertake it. It is our good fortune to be able to afford the luxury of proleptic. The remainder of the task belongs to subsequent discussions.

• • • •

Mary Anne Raywid is with the School of Education at Hofstra University, Hempstead, New York.

52

Discussion at First General Session

Discussion following the presentations at the first general session focused primarily on two features of the papers: the question of uncertainty with respect to definitions about civic education and knowledge of the research base in the field, and consensus about the importance of the field and its relationship to issues of equity and equality in American education and society.

Second General Session: What Should the Humanities Contribute to the Civic Learning of Teachers and Administrators?

The second general session of the seminar was moderated by Verne Stadtman. The focus of this session was on the question: What should academic departments in the humanities, at both the undergraduate and graduate level, do to improve the civic learning of teachers and administrators?

Presentations in response to this question were made by Sidney Hook, Larry T. McGehee, Donald R. Warren, and Christopher J. Lucas.

The Humanities of Civic Learning

By Sidney Hook

There is a penumbra of ambiguity about the phrase "civic learning" which makes it difficult to focus a discussion that aims to reach recommendations to improve teacher education and ultimately the quality of political life and behavior in the United States. Taken purely descriptively "civic learning" may be construed as information about the structure and function of the political process, the kind of information purveyed in the textbooks of traditional courses in civics, familiarity with whose elements is required of those who seek to acquire citizenship. I am rather doubtful that the humanities except for the disciplines in the classics and history can contribute much to enhance the quality of civic education save in the way of comparison with the civic system of the past. And even here, over and above the knowledge about the political dimensions of their subject matters normally imparted to students in the course of their study, classicists and historians may regard a concern with other matters as pedagogically more rewarding.

I am assuming that the question of what the humanities should do to improve the civic learning of "teachers and administrators" really means of "potential" teachers and administrators and not that of

persons who are already launched on their professional careers. If that assumption is justified, then the question can only mean, since the overwhelming number of their students have not yet made their vocational choices, what should academic teachers in the humanities do to improve the civic education of all their students?

By civic education I mean the intensive study and understanding of American political institutions, especially the system of self-government, its value commitments and assumptions, its relevant history, its problems, burdens, and opportunities, its challenges and alternatives—in short the theory and practice of the free and open democratic society as it has developed in the United States.

That there is not sufficient understanding among American students of the nature of the democratic free society seems obvious to any reflective observer of academic American life since the 1960s.

I have elsewhere argued that there is no intrinsic connection either analytically of historically between the study of the humanistic disciplines and the defense of the free society. But the humanities can contribute to the conceptual clarification of the idea of a free society, the meaning of political freedom, and what commitment to our democratic system of government involves.

In what follows I shall mention several themes suggested by my own teaching experience from the 1920s to the 1970s whose exploration is likely to generate a profounder grasp of the free society. I am not talking about persuading or winning over students to the virtues of democracy. By the time students reach the college or university level of education, if they are not already supporters of the democratic system, they are not likely to become its partisans.

Indeed, in my experience I have found students who have in virtue of their earlier schooling already been overwhelmingly won over in favor of democracy woefully uninformed about what that implies, what the alternatives to democracy are, and how to justify their democratic allegiance if challenged. For example, I have heard students especially in the 1960s argue that among the rights they enjoy as citizens of a democracy is "the right to revolution." They usually believe it is enshrined in the Declaration of Independence, which was born of a revolution. Some even entertain the stultifying notion that there is a legal right to revolution as if, since a legal right is one that the state is expected to enforce, the state has an obligation to facilitate its own overthrow. But most of those who recognize that under some circumstances there is a moral right to revolution, fail to understand the difference between a revolution in a situation where there exists no other means of remedying evils, and one in which processes of freely given consent operate, and in which a minority may peacefully become

or win over a majority. This second condition can be fulfilled only in a democratic political system. Then comes the argument that truly shocks the uninformed: that in a functioning political democracy no principled democrat can consistently believe in the right to revolution. When on moral grounds he or she does, and it is conceivable that a democracy may, after allowing all rights of dissent and opposition to its minorities, act oppressively and unjustly, this is tantamount to repudiating the system of democratic self-government altogether.

Or students will talk about different kinds of democracy—economic, ethnic, cultural, educational, or what not—as distinct from political democracy and contrasted with it. But if the term democracy in any context presupposes freedom of expression, uncoerced participation, and resolution of differences by discussion, then it is demonstrable that although political democracy without some other forms of democracy is incomplete, any other kind of democracy without political democracy is impossible. This insight reduces to rubbish apologetic claims made by twentieth century totalitarianisms to be "new" or "higher" or "organic" or "directed" or "socialist" democracies.

There is a number of more fundamental ideas that humanists should seek to clarify so that students can see their topical relevance to the nature of the free society. Freedom has many meanings. In its most basic sense it is the expression of uncoerced choice. Freedom of choice in a self-governing community carries with it the freedom to determine the nature of the institutions under which the citizens of the community decide to live. It follows that the free society is not necessarily a free-enterprise society, but one in which the citizens are free to choose the kind and direction of the economy under which they desire to live. Every economic system has actual and potential effects on the operation of the political system, a phenomenon of enormous complexity. Whoever is committed to the preservation of the political democratic order of free choice must in principle oppose any concentration or monopoly of power, economic or any other, that undermines or subverts political democracy whose strategic freedoms are enumerated in the Bill of Rights.

If a democracy is based on freely given assent, it must recognize the right of dissent and its associated freedoms. Often, however, these freedoms are regarded as absolute and never subject to abridgment. Students sometimes overlook the fact that when we approve of freedom we do not mean the freedom to do anything one pleases.

All expressions of a desire for freedom are expressions of a desire for specific, desirable freedoms, e.g., for speech, press, assembly, equal treatment under the law. Once we express a desire for a specific freedom or right, we are at the same time calling for the denial of

freedom of action to those who would frustrate or prevent us from exercising it. I have no freedom of speech unless you are denied the freedom to prevent me from speaking. Just as obvious is the conflict of freedoms in the democratic community. Freedom of the press may prevent me from receiving a fair trial. The resolution of such conflicts of rights, the order of their priorities and limits, is a complex process—legislative and judicial—which ultimately involves, and ideally requires, the participation of the citizens who delegate the authority to make decisions.

This raises the problem of the role of authority in democratic politics. The most powerful arguments against political democracy in the history of thought were formulated by Plato, who believed that only the possession of superior knowledge about the nature of things, society, and human beings gave the right to rule over a people. In the modern world, where government is largely administrative and concerns itself with issues ostensively beyond the grasp of the masses of citizens, it is argued that only those who know—the experts—can be entrusted with the power to make decisions.

Years ago when I taught Plato's *Republic*, and for pedagogic reasons played devil's advocate to test the students' understanding of Plato's critique of democracy and his defense of the rule of those who know, i.e., the experts on human welfare and the other tangled concerns of government, I was impressed by the readiness with which the students abandoned their nominal democratic faith. Yet it was Plato himself who in the tenth book of the *Republic* revealed the Achilles' heel of his argument. He maintains that it is the user or consumer of a bed that is the best judge of a good bed, rather than the maker. To change his illustration, it is he or she who wears the shoes who knows best where they pinch. And not all the expert opinion in the world can take the place of the considered judgment of the ordinary people who justifiably claim that they have a right to change their political shoes in the light of their experience. In other words, in a democratic community it is not necessary to be an expert to judge the policy recommendations of experts. Not irrelevant to the question is the fact that experts often disagree among themselves, as well as the impressive historical evidence that every form of elite rule or enlightened despotism in time, when conflicts of interest arise, manifests its despotism more clearly than its enlightenment.

Another basic obstacle to understanding the case for democracy is the absence of an historical sense. This takes various forms. One is the failure to recognize that there is no escape from the facts and traditions of history which do not present us in every situation with desirable alternatives. All historical situations limit freedom of action. We never

face a world as fresh and open to ideal opportunities as at the beginning. Ideals, to be sure, are indispensable in setting directions and making decisions, but in an imperfect world in which man--"that crooked stick"—finds himself, there are no smooth ideal solutions.

The absence of an historical perspective may lead to a distorted vision in the present. The world is never what it should be. It always requires amendment and reform even as we raise our sights continually higher. The continuous disparity between the real and ideal and the cumulative frustration it generates often produce a tendency among the tender-minded to seek shortcuts and extreme solutions to ideal goals. Unless we look back and see the distance gained, not to rest in complacency but to take heart for renewed effort, we may be tempted to abandon the very system by which genuine historical progress has been made. This was the message of Roy Wilkins, former head of the NAACP, preached to his black oppressed brothers all his life.

The uses and perspective of history enable us to anchor our general principles to the specific time and place in which we seek to apply them. The whole recent discussion of church and state relations illustrates the confusion resulting on all sides from the failure to consider moral norms in an historical context. The moral issue is one of religious freedom to believe and to disbelieve. England, the Scandinavian countries, and Israel have officially established churches, but their citizens enjoy religious freedom today. There has never been a complete separation of religion and state in the United States, or in any country in which the churches are exempted from taxation. The specific question is what policy to pursue that will diminish the presence or likelihood of coercion against religious freedom in our historical context. What is possible when one starts from scratch may not be feasible centuries later.

Sometimes the discovery of historical relativity is used as a justification for accepting the validity of the status quo, wherever it is found, with the corollary that citizens of all states must naturally support their own system of government whether totalitarian or democratic. When considerations of morality are introduced the relativity of moral judgment is mistakenly often identified with moral subjectivity. The obvious fact that judgments that are relative (or relational) may be objective, too, is overlooked.

The value judgments that sustain the belief in democracy are moral judgments, and the relevance of moral considerations should be stressed in considering both the consequences of action and the consequences of inaction. This emphasis on the ethics of responsibility should be brought into play not only in discussion of technological issues (there are no important questions affecting human welfare that are purely technical) but in other areas of human experience. One can

appreciate the intellectual passion behind the views which proclaim "art for art's sake" or "science for science's sake," but their student protagonists should be taught that in the life of reason no area of experience can enjoy absolute autonomy beyond the reach of moral evaluation. This is true of religion, too. Man was not made for the sabbath, but the sabbath was made for man. On the other hand, those who affect indifferentism to the basic political issues of our time or affect a neutralism that goes beyond suspension of judgment until more evidence is available, can be shown to be freeloaders profiting from the order and system on which they turn their backs and their obligation to those who made that system possible.

There are many other misperceptions, misconceptions, and emotional biases that cloud the students' understanding of what commitment to a free and open society entails. Such understanding of American democracy is perfectly compatible with a knowledge of its multiple shortcomings and past and present injustices. Indeed, such understanding requires it. But here our enumeration of problems and issues obviously cannot be complete.

One final consideration by way of summary. The investigation and evaluation of the institutional practices that define democratic political life, e.g., the principle of majority rule, the recognition of the rights of minorities, and other practices, can be justified by their consequences, including a comparative study of their presence and absence elsewhere, without assuming that there must be agreement on first or last things. What is required to make democracy feasible is behavior in conformity with the rules of democratic political life and not necessarily agreement on any specific justification of these rules. It is not necessary to agree on ultimate values or ends, whatever they are, and however they are defined, to accept immediate and instrumental values. Travellers with divergent destinations may still travel a good part of their journey together. Without tolerance and a willingness to compromise, democratic political life trembles on the verge of anarchy or civil war. But we don't have to agree on the religions or metaphysical justifications of tolerance to recognize its virtue, and its central importance in a well-functioning democracy. But there are limits. If we are committed to the value of tolerance, we cannot tolerate the actively intolerant.

• • • •

Sidney Hook is a senior research fellow with the Hoover Institution on War, Revolution and Peace at Stanford University, Stanford, California.

Getting the House in Order

By Larry T. McGehee

The best thing college and university humanities departments could do for elementary and secondary school teachers and administrators is first to get their own house in order. Humanities departments and colleges of education may be on the same campuses, but they are so separated that they might as well be in Patagonia and Paraguay. Humanities professors decreasingly have access to prospective teachers, have little say in certification standards, and too often cannot or will not be colleagues with teachers of teachers.

Within their own liberal arts province, the divisions are just as pronounced. To think that humanities departments think of themselves in such broad terms as a whole wide area such as "humanities" is stretching credibility. Professors of literature are split from professors of composition, departments of English from schools of communication, fine arts from liberal arts, religion from history, philosophy from government, languages from economics. Western civilization is a survey course, not a way of life. Teacher education is an isolated wing of a campus.

One wonders, then, if higher education humanities can have any real

impact upon elementary and secondary teaching of the civic arts, if it cannot find transcendence and integrity within its own corridors in its ivied halls. The isolation of the humanities from teacher education and from each other is an unabating trend that has yet to be impeded.

On the other hand, perhaps the cultural neutrality and narrowness and illiteracy with which elementary and secondary school teachers are blamed these days may be an opportunity for higher education's internal divisions as much as it is a dilemma. If higher education professors join the public in pointing accusing fingers downward to the elementary and secondary teachers, do they not find in that common gesture, at least, a common cause? Cannot unlikes unite around remedying elsewhere what they have not remedied among themselves? Is not the way for a physician to cure himself found in testing cures on others?

There are some experiments that are being tried by humanities professors. In the interests of being specific but yet brief, I shall cite two types only. The National Endowment for the Humanities experiments, especially under chairman William Bennett's prodding, come immediately to mind. In these prolonged two-or-more-weeks seminars, the emphasis is upon content, rather than methodology. One can't teach the *Odyssey* in any contagious way unless one has read it and knows its perambulations. One can't teach economics without knowing Adam Smith and John Kenneth Galbraith. One can't teach Shakespeare without baptism in his works. These seminars follow as much as they lead. They respond to the innate instinct of teachers for more content. Less visible are their predecessors: hundreds of summer content courses for teachers all across the nation, offered at most colleges and universities.

There are more daring deeds that can be done, for the humanities content seminars are only a marginal start towards cultural literacy. They hinge on the theory of a creative minority of teachers serving as role models and standardbearers to the teaching profession.

Assuming that teacher salaries and admission standards into the profession rise—something not to be taken for granted—what specifically can the humanities professors do for instilling civic learning in teachers? One place they can start is simply by getting to know the neighboring teachers socially and professionally. In an age of declining enrollments, it is in the professors' self-interest to do just that, as a source of students. Even if there were no enrollment crisis in the colleges and graduate programs, it is in the professorial self-interest to have <u>good</u> students. The way to that goal is through teachers. The several bonds between teachers and professors must be new-knit. They must learn to link to one another, to look at one another without looking up or down at each other. Teachers can invite professors into their classrooms, and professors can bring teachers into their class-

rooms, after they have invited each other into their homes and clubs. Afternoons during the school year can be as convenient for getting together as are summers. What professor today has afternoon classes? Team teaching, semester leaves, or half-leaves could expedite that two-way traffic. But first, dinners and cocktail hours in which teachers and professors meet without a speaker or agenda are good first steps. At Wofford College, we plan to hold a three-day retreat for 45 professors, 45 area teachers, and their spouses, at a coastal resort.

Beyond that social interaction and collegiality, which are intended to counteract teachers' inferiority complexes, a specific step can be institutional. In any given community, it would not be asking too much to have a continuing colloquium every other month, rotating between campus and school sites, or professorial and teacher homes, on the simple topic of "what ought we to study." At Wofford, we plan for thirteen departments to have four such meetings a year, after the retreat, and to host larger groups for special afternoon symposia on two other occasions, with teachers as co-hosts.

The most difficult issue in a pluralistic and individualistic society is agreeing on what ought to be held in common by all. E. D. Hirsch, Jr., has boldly—but also knowledgeably—asserted that the loss of a "canon" of common knowledge and belief is responsible for our civic anarchy.

In reductionist terms, I am inclined to say that we lost ourselves—our civic selves—when we did away with the King James Bible, the *Book of Common Prayer*, memorizing Shakespeare, reading *Silas Marner*, and using *McGuffey's Reader* and the Harcourt Brace handbook. We assume that what we read is unimportant to civic literacy, when the truth is that we can never transcend our specialities or our ethnocentricities until we learn the common content and subtleties of our cultural communication.

Some people I admire, especially Henry Steele Commager, admonish us that such a view—that there is some core of knowledge we must share in order to speak, write, or listen to one another—is dangerous. Better anarchy than a puritanically imposed social order. Better heterogeneity than homogeneity. Better diversity than sameness.

But I do not see how there can be appreciation of and tolerance for diversity without a commonly held standard or core of communication that builds a community in which diversity can be appreciated. In "The Second Coming," Yeats says "things fall apart, the center cannot hold, the best lack all conviction, and the worst are full of passionate intensity." "Apocalypse Now" is the only alternative to homogenized basic learning. If we do not know together and ponder together the core of the humanities from which we have descended or ascended, who will

there be to preserve the center from which we come? A common language and a common canon of knowledge are necessary preliminaries to diversity and tolerance. A hard line on English as the national language has to be taken.

The truth is we will never create or rediscover that common canon, that simple core of shared humanities learning. But what can happen, by turning every campus and every schoolhouse into a forum, in which the professorial patricians and teacher plebeians can meet and discourse on equal terms, is the emergence of new respect for one another and for the great body of wisdom over which supposedly they preside as custodians and transmitters. The process may be more important to civic learning, by breaking down stereotypes and class structures and isolation, than the outcome of a unified body of knowledge for which the process is suggested. If we seldom meet physically, we shall seldom meet intellectually, and our citizen-students shall pass us, like separated mileposts, on a road to civic oblivion.

• • • •

Larry T. McGehee is vice president for development and professor of religion at Wofford College, Spartanburg, South Carolina.

Informed Consent: The Humanities as Civic Education

By Donald R. Warren

The topic is civic education in the United States, specifically the civic education of school teachers and administrators. It is the sort of matter than can be clouded by profundities—there is such a thing as trivializing a serious issue by taking it seriously—and that is not my intention. On one level the problem is clear enough. American young people exhibit embarrassing ignorance about their form of government. And if the President of the United States thinks that the "wall of separation between church and state" is Constitutional language, we can assume that other American adults harbor similar misinformation about their guarantees and responsibilities as citizens. We need not pause to justify our focus. The topic is timely and urgent, although it addresses only a part of a pervasive problem. This paper addresses a subpart: How can the humanities help with the civic education of school personnel?

Our national ideals lead us to rest the strength and resiliency of our democratic society on the informed consent of its citizens to be governed. Such a vision suggests that in the United States all education is civic education. Not wanting to leave the matter to chance, we have also insisted on direct preparation for citizenship. The task has lately fallen

to history and civics teachers in secondary schools and to social studies teachers in elementary schools, apparently without the desired effects. Surely, however, our goals exceed a tested level of political literacy among the young. If not, the problem becomes one of socialization or indoctrination rather than education, we merely face the task of preparing servile minds. This implicit warning must be sounded because we are here to discuss the preparation of teachers and school administrators. Direct and indirect pedagogies play necessary roles in the process and, therefore, cannot be divorced from either the content school people learn during their preparation or the content they later teach. Before we consider the pedagogical issue, however, we should clarify the goals of civic education. What do we want it to achieve?

Let me illustrate the complexities by pointing, not too simply, I hope, to the quite different responses of three scholars to developments in Germany during the 1930s. By most definitions, Martin Heidegger, Paul Tillich, and Dietrich Bonhoeffer fell within the humanities tradition. They were also German citizens. For several reasons, their reactions to the Nazi regime bear on our topic. As Tillich bitterly recalled, Heidegger continued his teaching routine, and was allowed to do so, by the expedient insertion of the required salute at the beginning of his university classes. Tillich fled the country, knowing that no compromise on his part could dispel the cloud of disloyalty he was under. Bonhoeffer also left but elected subsequently to return. There is some evidence that he collaborated with an underground anti-Nazi group, but he went back to Germany primarily as a preacher. That he established a vocal pulpit is incontrovertible and the consequences were predictable. He was imprisoned and later executed as a traitor. In each of these cases, matters of temperament and extenuating circumstances should be noted. My point, however, is not biography. Rather, by way of this parable, I am interested in the qualifications for good citizenship, for that presumably is the goal of civic education. For his part, Tillich dismissed suggestions that Germany in the 1930s represented a special case, from which generalizations should not be drawn. The "situation," to use his word, was recognizable, and so was the style of leadership that lit the match. Who then was the good citizen? From whose perspective? Answers must be located in time, not to establish causality, which would be simplistic, but to know their place in an unfolding story. It matters only slightly that Germany lost the war. But did that end something, start it, or fall someplace in between? As time passes, the answer tends to shift.

I'm inclined to apologize for the illustration. It is sharply drawn and seems to leave room for only extreme reactions: eschatological musings or radical relativism. I endorse neither. If the anecdote is instructive, it

suggests that our topic—civic education—refers to a process, the realization or purpose of which emerges and changes along the way. Even in regard to the elementary matter of obedience to the law, what qualifies as good citizenship in a given context may fail the test in another. The specific educational task also varies, although in general it remains the same: to correct error. The constant element is moral choice, the imperative merger of civic learning and public responsibility in particular acts of citizenship. The effects can be cumulative for the individual and the community, but in a democratic society changes, even sharp ones, of political sensibility and expression are allowed. Informed consent always leaves room for dissent without, of course, requiring it or even promising it an audience. Informed consent is the mode of democratic participation. It is never passive, which means its educational component does not permit smugness.

The academic departments of the humanities cannot limit their contributions to civic education to perservice or inservice school professionals. Typically, they provide virtually no courses solely for education majors either at the undergraduate or graduate level. They offer civic learning to all comers, and they do so intentionally or not. Under present circumstances the results, however, are problematic. To increase their probability of success, humanists have considerable work to do. Following are two examples of points at which they can strengthen civic education.

First, in regard to the content of civic education, the humanities have more to offer than the familiar, if treasured, political literature. They can promote both civic literacy and critical understanding of citizenship, although some departments have more direct access to the necessary sources than others. Nor is it adequate for humanists to retreat to the old saw about liberal education as the proper preparation for enlightened public life. Short as it is, our historical memory includes too many instances of well-educated barbarians to allow easy acceptance of any promise that the liberal arts curriculum drives political morality. The point is moot because of the impact of advanced specialization on humanities curricula and on faculty relations. Humanists who received their Ph.D.s within the last two decades are probably unprepared to offer more than the ubiquitous survey course as their contribution to general education, and if they intend to survive within a university, they are better advised to sharpen their expertise through research, publication, and graduate instruction. The result has been rampant academic pluralism, scholarly self indulgence, and a decline of large scale conceptual work.

Talking about the humanities is relatively easy, but beyond a general jurisdictional definition no unifying or compelling vision welds this

family of disciplines in common purpose. The centrifugal forces are particularly evident in discussions about curriculum. As typically presented at colleges and universities, general education consists of unprovocative, if sometimes entertaining, survey courses, or it resembles a series of compromises among warring academic factions more than a core curriculum. Imagine, also, a group of social historians trying to agree on a course of study for high schools.

This state of affairs suggests that the humanities are not well-prepared to contribute content for civic education. But they could become so, if they were willing to tackle the conceptual curriculum problem posed by their fragmentation. The research specializations have generated new knowledge and understandings that offer rich resources for civic education. The histories and literatures of minorities and cultural enclaves in the United States are only recently available. Focused on particular social issues or on the effects of policy, interdisciplinary community studies and social history provide fresh insights on the public lives of ordinary citizens. Such content is relevant to civic education, but it cannot be made to conform to traditional curriculum formats. Forced to exhibit rational developments of effects from causes, to narrate events rather than explore them, it will be rendered falsely irenic. We may be tempted in devising content for civic education to misname the enemy, to range the options from content that is insufficiently pluralistic to a pacific pluralism that denies the texture of American life. Precisely because of the new research, the humanities can help solve this conceptual problem. Doing so would be a major contribution to civic education curricula.

It is fashionable nowadays to think of educational content as separable from pedagogy. Several recent manifestoes on public schools, *A Nation at Risk* being chief among them, favor this ironically dysfunctional approach to promoting academic excellence. Plans to eliminate pedagogy from teacher preparation are in various stages of completion in New Jersey and elsewhere. If we commit this error in civic education, we will insure its failure as an educational effort. Recent studies provide convincing evidence that the way a course is organized and taught can affect student learning. Regarding civic education specifically, we have indications that some instructional techniques not only promote the desired learning outcomes, they also encourage affirmations of democratic values and interest in political participation. I refer you to research and reviews in this area by Judith Torney-Purta. My point simply acknowledges the necessity of focusing simultaneously on content and pedagogy in civic education from the outset.

If humanities faculty are to be effective in civic education, they have considerable methodological work to do. Specifically, they will have to

relax their fascination with words and recognize that teaching ability does not automatically follow as their students acquire academic knowledge. The research referred to in the previous paragraph suggests that the influence of pedagogy is such that it can produce learning outcomes independently of formal objectives. This suggests further that civic education in academic settings is uncontainable. Political literacy, values, and dispositions take form by virtue of course organization and teaching strategies, whether the subject matter is freshman English, Eastern philosophy, or American history. If humanities faculty persist in taking the philological detour, where words, meanings, and the connections of concepts, values, and actions go separate ways, they will nonetheless generate civic learning. But it will be of dubious educational or political value in a democratic society.

Among several possibilities, humanities departments and faculties can make two significant contributions to civic education. First, they have unique resources for addressing a fundamental conceptual dilemma. Hard intellectual labor is needed to devise civic education curricula that deal accurately with political pluralism and dissent. It would be easier to construct a tale of common values, opportunities, and political history, but such a portrayal would drain American citizenship of its most vital and compelling experiences. Second, the humanities share with other disciplines the capacity to offer forms and strategies of teaching that induce both appreciation for democratic values and processes and interest in political participation. These two contributions to civic education would be of particular value to school teachers and administrators, who can then be realistically expected to go and do likewise.

• • • •

Donald R. Warren is a professor and chair of the Department of Education Policy, Planning, and Administration, College of Education, University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland.

Civic Learning and the Humanities: Some Presuppositions of the Inquiry

By Christopher J. Lucas

In C. P. Cavafy's poem, "Expecting the Barbarians," the populace and emperor assemble in the public square, awaiting an invasion of barbarians. The legislators have abandoned the senate because the new regime will impose its own laws. The orators have prepared no speeches because barbarians appreciate neither eloquence nor fine phrases. But suddenly the crowd grows solemn and despondent. The streets empty quickly. News has come from the frontier: the barbarians are not coming; there are no more barbarians. "And now, without the barbarians," the poet asks, "what is to become of us? After all, they would have been a kind of solution."

Leave aside for the moment the fact that surely nowadays we suffer no lack of barbarians; that, indeed, they are already among us; and, quite possibly, that we have lost the capacity to recognize barbarians when we meet them. The point is, an overwhelming mysterious "they" always supplies a solution of sorts when it offers an excuse for inaction. The course of events, our fate, will be shaped by vast and remote forces we cannot hope to control—history, society, the established order of things, or whatever. Thus, the reform impulse may falter in confront-

ing a challenge of awesome complexity. A judgment about what academic departments in the humanities can or should do to improve the civic learning of educators affords a possible case in point.

On the face of it, the task of galvanizing academic humanists in the pursuit of a great public purpose poses a formidable undertaking. The difficulties of overcoming institutional inertia or deflecting established usage from its current drift are notorious. The temptation therefore is to conclude that before anything can be done, everything must be put right—in which case, since the latter is impossible, the former is impossible. Apropos is John Kenneth Galbraith's remark somewhere, that faced with having to change our ways or proving there is no need to do so, most of us get busy on the proof.

Nevertheless, as I shall argue, the task may not be quite so impossible as it appears. The first order of business, however, is to sort out some of the presuppositions behind the inquiry. One of these touches upon the question whether the humanities can be made to speak to questions of civic virtue. Although it is sometimes disputed, there are ample grounds for confidence. Humane letters furnish an almost infinite array of possibilities in this respect. Opportunities abound for pondering the meaning of citizenship; for analyzing civic rights, duties, privileges, and immunities; and for giving dramatic illustration to problems arising out of the relationship between the individual and the state. One can imagine readily enough a full-blown civic curriculum drawn exclusively from the study of language and literature, poetry and theology, history and philosophy. Even if for some odd reason the modern social sciences were to be omitted from a liberal course of studies, humanistic disciplines, both ancient and contemporary, might well suffice of themselves.

With the advent of constitutional government in the Greek city-states came an acute awareness of the difference between citizen and subject, between self-governance and abject submission to despotism. The Spartan heralds, according to Herodotus, addressed the Persian commander: "You have experience of half the matter; but the other half is beyond your knowledge. A slave's life you understand; but, never having tested liberty, you cannot tell whether it is sweet or not." And so began a momentous conversation on the nature of citizenship. It is a central theme in Plato's *Republic*; it is explored at length in Aristotle's *Politics*. The virtues of the citizen are analyzed in Plutarch, Tacitus, and Plotinus; they are elaborated upon in the writings of countless others: Augustine, Aquinas, Dante, Shakespeare, and Montaigne, to mention only a few. Political citizenship in relation to moral virtue is an issue dealt with by Milton and Bacon and Montesquieu, by Pascal and Swift and Gibbon, and so on *ad infinitum*. Similarly, and at the risk of

reiterating the obvious, questions having to do with conscience, loyalty, and civil disobedience do not begin with Gandhi or Thoreau—they are treated in the literature and moral philosophy of all ages.

Consider, for example, the plight of Sophocles' Antigone when she says of the human laws she defies, "it was not Zeus who had published me that edict, nor deemed I that the decrees were of such force that a mortal could override the unwritten and unfailing statutes of heaven. For their life is not of today or yesterday, but for all time, and no man knows when they were first put forth." The tension between political obligation and moral imperative is likewise explored in Dostoevsky's *Brothers Karamazov*, in Koestler's *Darkness at Noon*, in Milton's *Samson Agonistes*, and innumerable other works. Again, how else is one to understand Confucian precepts except against the public context of their origins in the feudal chaos of the Hundred Schools period?

Countless other allusions might be adduced. Suffice it to say, as the humanities exhibit ways of living a life in conflict or concert with others, as they are the studies *par excellence* of intersubjectivity and human consciousness, then to that extent are they capable of illuminating the moral, spiritual, and esthetic possibilities of civic experience. In one sense at least, properly deployed, their potential for public resonance is virtually limitless.

A second presupposition behind the present inquiry—one lending it special force and urgency—is that the cause of effective democratic citizenship is in trouble. Specific factors accounting for the seeming rigidity, unresponsiveness, and fragmentation of today's political structures, for instance, are undoubtedly manifold. I leave it to others much wiser than I to analyze more fully the circumstances of the present crisis. But at the very least, one should take note of the curious and tragic disjunction now prevailing between private common sense and public insanity, the alarming discrepancy between the relative efficacy with which we pursue private ends and our collective impotence in the face of possible nuclear annihilation, incipient ecological devastation, or chronic social injustice.

I claim no originality whatsoever for the suggestion that, so far as civic education is concerned, part of the problem is rooted in confusion over what effective citizenship can mean in the contemporary social order. As Charles Frankel observes, when Aristotle analyzed the natural history of politics, he moved by easy stages from problems of domestic economy to the operations of a city-state. The assumption was that the same language, the same general style of reasoning, and the same fundamental community of experience applied in private and public experience alike. Clearly, some such assumption, preserved in the eighteenth-century ideals of our founding fathers, likewise anchors

72

most theories of liberal democratic government. The relevance of common sense to public problems, the possibility of checking the narrowness of professional expertise against the wider experience of ordinary people, the existence of a community of sentiment and useful intelligence—these are the conditions upon which vigorous democratic politics usually have been thought to depend.

But to an increasing extent, traditional notions of the polity inherited from a simpler agrarian past now have a quaintness about them ordinarily associated with horseless carriages, kerosene lamps, and ice-cream socials. Today's mass democracy reflects a much-altered social reality: a world of mega-structures, of corporate entities seemingly possessed of independent lives of their own, of professional guilds wielding enormous power, of multiple layers of managerial and administrative agencies pressing upon the organization of social life. Moreover, the sheer size and complexity of policy issues dwarf common understanding. With each of us absorbed in specialized routines that divide our experiences and habits, who among the laity is able to master the esoterica of, say, arms limitations lore, or to penetrate the mysteries of international monetary affairs, or to recommend measures to control inflation?

It is all very well to concur with Aristotle that a citizen is "he who has the power to take part in the deliberative or judicial administration of any state." But the question today is less one of power and more of ability to recognize and safeguard the common welfare. As C. Wright Mills noted many years ago in *The Power Elite*, popular images of democracy are still employed as justifications of power in American society. But they are inadequate even as approximate models of how issues are raised or decided upon. The idea of a community of publics is not a description of fact, but the assertion of an ideal, an assertion of a legitimation masquerading as fact. More accurate perhaps is the view of mass democracy as a struggle of powerful, large-scale interests and associations, which in turn stand between decisions made by the state, the corporation, and the will of the individual citizen as a member of the public. Small wonder then there is so little consensus on what specific information, values, and skills constitute the core of citizenship education. And without a well-defined object, the best-intentioned pedagogy is likely to prove ineffectual.

Assuming, however, that we know what we are about, and that the humanities have a vital contribution to make in promoting civic learning, the original question reasserts itself: How might academic departments whose stock-in-trade is humanistic study be induced to focus their energies upon the task at hand? The answer, I suspect, is that driven by sheer necessity and a sure instinct for survival, academic

humanists will enlist in the cause of their own accord. To show why this is so, one need only reflect for a moment on the enfeebled condition of the humanities themselves in today's cultural environment.

Writing recently in *The Washington Post*, Haynes Johnson reports on faculty perceptions of today's students. The common complaint is that collegians have no sense of history, no background with which to place in perspective the actions of the past that have shaped their world, no framework for judging current political debates. They are driven mainly by considerations of occupational utility, not by any lofty desire for liberal self-development. Whether it was ever otherwise in academe is open to question. What is undeniable, however, is that as never before colleges and universities are engaged in what has become their primary task, namely, training and certifying workers for the labor force.

With the wholesale vocationalism of higher education, predictably, has come the loss of a constituency for liberal studies generally and the humanities in particular. They have been left naked in the marketplace. Brave attempts to integrate professional and liberal concerns enjoy mixed success at best. But having failed to persuade students that the personal goals of a liberal education are still worth pursuing, or that the humanities have a viable (albeit indirect) contribution to offer for career preparation, academic humanists understandably have been thrown on the defensive. The kindest judgment is that they increasingly play a peripheral role within the larger academic enterprise.

What then does the future hold for the humanities? Are they relics of a pre-technocratic age? Are they vestigial atavisms destined to atrophy and finally disappear? Can they be resuscitated only when they cease to be custodians of a moribund tradition and learn to speak in a modern idiom, drawing perhaps exclusively on contemporary sources for substance and inspiration? Or, alternatively, do they represent a heritage so important that to lose it would be to abandon the very qualities that make people greater than the systems they devise? Is it true, as some argue, that the humanities spell the difference between a society of automatons and a community of civilized human beings?

Whatever the truth of the matter, if popular support for civic learning continues, teachers of the humanities will seize upon this public rationale for what they do. That is, the case for the humanities as a vital element in the training of citizens will be pressed enthusiastically if it promises to legitimate such studies in a more persuasive fashion than have traditional apologetics. Likewise, if academic departments realize that it is in their own interest to offer curricula aimed at the inculcation of civic virtue, most assuredly they will attempt to do so. The response will come first from whatever small liberal arts colleges manage to

survive the 1980s and into the decade following. Humanists in the larger research-oriented universities, on the other hand, where the transformation of humanistic studies into highly professionalized academic disciplines is far advanced, will probably be the last to respond.

A final thought on teacher education: As presently constituted, preparatory programs typically give only cursory attention to humanistic studies. This is unlikely to change significantly in the foreseeable future. A ubiquitous ideology of technique, a presumption that future teachers must be schooled at length in matters of pedagogy and classroom management, is deeply entrenched. It will not soon be overthrown. Hence, the pressure to squeeze in still more technical professional courses within an already overcrowded curriculum is apt to increase, not diminish, with the passage of time. The result, of course, will be another generation of educator-technocrats for whom Plato's definition of education as "the constraining and direction of youth towards the right reason which the law affirms" will be quite literally unintelligible.

• • • •

Christopher J. Lucas is professor of education studies in the College of Education, University of Missouri-Columbia, Columbia, Missouri.

Discussion at Second General Session

Discussion following the four presentations at the second general session focused on four particular issues: an apparent need to better address the higher purposes of civic learning, or to reach beyond simple appeals to nationalism, tradition, and patriotism; the need to overcome structural boundaries in our institutions of higher education and to encourage cooperation and interchange between disciplines, departments, and schools and colleges; the need to give greater focus and importance to the co-curricular experiences in higher education, in which civic learning can be greatly enhanced; and the need to make student learning a more central goal and feature of all of our educational efforts.

Third General Session: What Should the Social Sciences Contribute in the Civic Learning of Teachers and Administrators?

The moderator for the third general session of the seminar was Michael W. Kirst. The focus of this session was on the question: What should academic departments in the social sciences, both graduate and undergraduate, do to improve the civic learning of teachers and administrators?

Presentations in response to this question were made by Manfred Stanley, James P. Shaver, Paul L. Murphy, and Judith Torney-Purta.

Reflections on Potential Contributions of the Social Sciences to Civic Education, with Special Reference to Schools of Public Affairs

By Manfred Stanley

At this time we are wisely restricted to substantive and practical proposals for civic education in the various institutions of higher education. No one assumes, of course, that theoretical controversies regarding the meaning of civic education have been laid to rest. But the time has indeed come to seek congenial relationships between theoretical orientations and contexts of practice. My focus is on the social sciences, especially as they might be taught and practiced in schools of public affairs. This restriction reflects both my experience and a growing belief that such "worldly" institutions provide more favorable environments than others for social science innovations in civic education.

The most significant reflections during the last quarter century or so on "method" in education, historiography, and social sciences seem to me elaborations of a wise passage in John Stuart Mill's *On Liberty*, especially if the word "creed" is thought to include ideas, techniques, and specializations:

> [W]hen the mind is no longer compelled, in the same degree as at

> first, to exercise its vital powers on the questions which its belief presents to it: there is a progressive tendency to forget all of the belief except the formularies, or to give it a dull and torpid assent, as if accepting it on trust dispensed with the necessity of realizing it in consciousness, or testing it by personal experience, until it almost ceases to connect itself at all with the inner life of the human being. Then are seen the cases, so frequent in this age of the world as almost to form the majority, in which the creed remains as it were outside the mind, incrusting and petrifying it against all other influences addressed to the higher parts of our nature; manifesting its power by not suffering any fresh or living conviction to get in, but itself doing nothing for the mind or heart except standing sentinel over them to keep them vacant.

This comment, which stands squarely in the tradition of Aristotle's sense of education as a civic phenomenon (however different in other respects Mill's thought may be), aptly summarizes much of our current practice in liberal arts and professional education alike. It is within this critique, with my accent upon democratic aspirations, that I locate my own views.

Allow me to begin with a provocatively cryptic comment on the intellectual context of an administrative culture not conducive to civic education reform in higher education. For many reasons, civic education efforts are hindered in administrative environments controlled by distinctions between liberal arts *vs.* vocational, collegiate *vs.* university, theoretical *vs.* practical, and cognitive *vs.* affective education. In place of these conceptions, we need to focus on the administrative implications of at least the following themes: A) Civic education as a universal dimension of inquiry rather than an abstractly separate—and often just homiletic—"civics" course. B) Theories as components of practice, rather than practice as applied theory. C) Types of youthful life experience as a necessary condition for students' appreciating the civic dimensions of formal higher education (e.g., note the growing debate over the educational justification of national service experiences intervening between secondary and higher education). D) Hermeneutic education as the cultivation of students' capacities to appreciate historical memory, identity as affective membership, and the musicality of cultural myth.

What has all this to do with the social sciences? I shall answer illustratively by describing the converging interests of scholars and students associated with the Maxwell School's Center for the Study of Citizenship, of which I am privileged to be the director. The following five questions are generic areas of inquiry at the Center, all of them civic

issues.

I. Do classical civic concepts such as public, polity, office, civic virtue, and citizenship have any relevance in a modern political culture based upon ideas of interest group, pluralism, cost-benefit, and public policy?

Many thoughtful people believe that the economic, demographic, and social conditions of modern democracy nullify any continuities of meaning between modern and pre-modern political concepts. Unlike those who would enthusiastically affirm such continuities for reasons of romance, ideology, or nostalgia, social scientists must recognize that complex topics are implicit in such a question. These topics include collective choice theory, the sociology of occupational specializations, the fate of community in large-scale economies, the processes of citizen participation in complex public decision-making, and the contrasts between classical and modern social science understandings of political concepts.

II. Can expert authority be reconciled with popular sovereignty?

The idea of citizenship implies a certain sacred zone of citizen authority or jurisdiction over public decisions. At an extreme, democracy suggests the political priesthood of all believers. A faint hint of illegitimacy bedevils the professions. Whatever their convictions, most Americans would likely agree that the borders between expert and citizen prerogative are vague and under constant negotiation. The criteria for professionalization are in dispute, as persisting debates over licensure, regulation, and credentialing demonstrate. That this is not new in American political history is amply illustrated in the Federalist *vs.* anti-Federalist debates before 1800. Center scholars address this general issue in a number of ways through their technical attention to topics such as technicism in public policy; the professionalization of education; the quality of education for the professions of medicine and law; the political consequences of the media industries for the practices of government; the history of the science museum and other public enlightenment movements; the relationships between constitutional law and public administration; and the political history, philosophy, and sociology of the social sciences themselves.

III. How do methodological controversies in social science and philosophy relate to civic issues?

Political arguments are commonly fortified with references to scientific studies, data, and findings. Yet there are serious questions about the research methods appropriate for testing hypotheses, or the logical analysis of concepts relevant to civic issues. Such questions have

received insufficient attention in the mainstream of philosophy and the social sciences. This concern is reflected in Center projects such as the methodological reexamination of twentieth century public opinion research; the empirical study of citizen participation hearings; and the reassessment of the axiomatic structure of collective choice theory in light of classical political concepts. Methodological concerns are also evident in Center interest in educational policy analysis, the academic division of labor, decision models in emergency medical practice, and the philosophies of social science. We try to arouse attention to the political philosophic implications of diversely defining concepts such as measurement, productivity, cost-benefit, and citizen participation.

IV. What is a non-technocratic, civic concept of "public policy"?

Social scientists should have a common concern for what the concept of public policy signifies in our time. For example, Center scholars share in various ways an interest in the following distinctions:

a. Public policies versus state policies. Is it always appropriate to regard public policies as synonymous with policies initiated and/or financed by government? The question is not merely where a policy originates, but where it should originate according to the political logic(s) of the American constitutional tradition. Depending on the issues, sometimes the public custom has been undermined by state policy (e.g., "social justice" issues), and sometimes public policy has successfully resisted state initiatives (e.g., Prohibition).

b. Technical policies versus sensitizing policies. Technical policies are activities regarded by their designers as technologically valid means for achieving finite goals most efficiently. Sensitizing policies are activities intended to refine people's awareness that there are problems which cannot (or should not) be specifiable as having such solutions. Many would say the elimination of malaria is a goal subject to technical policy in a way that the achievement of economic development or the greatest happiness of the greatest number is not. At stake here is the controversial concept of "social engineering."

c. Social policies versus cultural policies. Social policies are activities intended to affect socially organized arrangements such as employment rates, bureaucratic behavior, administrative organization, or financial allocations. Cultural policies are actions designed to affect the concepts and symbols, embodied in social institutions, that justify social practices. The dividing line is obscure and difficult to define in practice. In the American political culture, however, the formation of systematic, domestic cultural policy has been regarded as a illegitimate activity for government, certainly in any form that approaches the status of an official propaganda ministry or a state church. Yet cultural policies

emanating from both governmental and other sources profoundly affect society's symbolic order. Debates over the control of textbook content, advertising, and pornography are symptomatic of the need to examine this important distinction between types of public policy.

d. Pragmatism verus theory in public policy. The pragmatist, impatient with theories, and muddling through the political process, takes what can be had by way of achieving policies. To the theorist, the result is a patchwork quilt promising much and achieving little while exhausting the public's will to believe in rational process. What is the place of rational planning and theory in the policy process?

V. Is civic education possible in a modern culturally pluralistic democracy?

Center scholars share a concern for relating their research to the problems of civic pedagogy—education that contributes to the civic literacy of a democratic citizenry. This concern takes the form of attention to such topics as adequate criteria for civic literacy, political effects of hyper-specialization, connections between liberal arts and professional practice, and educational innovations needed to make these connections apparent.

The focus on civic education is reflected also in the Center's intention to explore the civic possibilities of local historical research. The rationale for this interest should be noted briefly. It is commonplace that large numbers of people these days feel unable to participate in the political world. In reply, advocates of civic mindedness often stress the need for putting brakes on cultural pluralism, or inducing through civics programs a high-minded sense of civic virtue. "Interest group selfishness" is frequently lamented. The economistically minded respond to this view with a cost-benefit analysis of civic involvement. They see citizens as responding to incentives that favor private pursuits and clear-cut interest constituencies.

Both approaches, however, are "unhistorical." They reduce the complex history of a concept like "interest" to a psychological argument, either of a moralistic or an economistic sort. Both raise the civic vocabulary to an abstract level that often clashes with people's sense of what went on in the past.

Local history has a potential contribution to make here. Local historiographical research can be designed to illuminate how people in the past helped to make the present environment, broadly defined. Such research can help to recover the processes and the memories appropriate to citizenship.

Local history can be part of a larger pattern of memory mediated by a reformed way of teaching American history. For example, local histori-

ography can shed much light on the sources of interest-group formation and consciousness. In days gone by many local communities failed to integrate major segments of the population into rational concepts and myths of citizenship. By not crediting these people for what they did (e.g., building the physical environment, inventing institutions such as labor unions, self-help associations, and reform movements), past communities created incentives for the outcast (immigrants, women, religious and ethnic minorities) to create their own political ties that we now think of as "interest groups." This often tragic and poignant story cannot adequately be told without local historical reference points.

Many local historical society directors, archivists, and oral historians of organizations are searching for new ways of using their resources and justifying their interests to a broader public. Showing that local history can also be political history contributes to civic education, to a revived sense of the importance of historical studies, to the development of a more historical perspective on policy issues, and to fruitful new forms of cooperation between historians and social scientists.

These five areas of inquiry cannot be segregated into issues of theoretic *vs.* applied science. Neither can they be regarded as issues special to liberal arts as against vocational concerns. Civic inquiry should help reconcile such tortured distinctions. Further, all these inquiries are profoundly interdisciplinary, yet not in the sense that they abandon the idiom of the separate disciplines in favor of some vacuous generalities. Instead, these questions make the perspectives and evolution of the separate social science disciplines themselves objects of civic inquiry. Finally, such investigations can best be carried forward less in the monastic seclusion of liberal arts colleges than in the worldly and "corrupt" contexts of the multiversity with its departments of arts and sciences, professional schools, and public affairs institutes. For all these reasons, I offer this program of inquiry as a model for what might be more universally extended as social science contributions to civic education.

• • • •

Manfred Stanley is a professor of sociology and director of the Center for the Study of Citizenship at the Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs, Syracuse University, Syracuse, New York.

The Social Sciences and the Civic Education of Teachers and Administrators

By James P. Shaver

The role of the total school in educating young people to be more effective and responsible citizens has been consistently overlooked in the preparation of teachers and school administrators. Except in the area of social studies, where there is a long-standing commitment to citizenship as a central objective and at least token efforts toward preparing teachers to prepare their students to be better citizens, the emphasis in educating teachers is largely on subject matter and on teaching and classroom management techniques. The professional preparation of administrators is centered on school management, including budgeting, staff supervision, and public relations, with little attention to civic learning. Yet, as R. Freeman Butts has noted, our country's founders were concerned that public education be developed to serve the civic purpose of strengthening the new republic.

Reference to the role of schooling in general (i.e., public education) in civic education, not to a particular curricular area such as the social studies, echoes John Dewey's reminder that "the school is fundamentally an institution erected by society to do a certain specific work—to exercise a certain specific function in maintaining the life and advanc-

ing the welfare of society." In that context, Dewey argues further in his *Moral Principles in Education* that the ethical responsibility of all educators to citizenship education must take into account that ours is a "democratic and progressive society." To fulfill that responsibility, society's ethical principles must permeate the school so that students can experience participation in democratic social life. Dewey recognized that not only the overall character of the school, but also the methods of instruction used by the teachers, had implications for civic education—across the school curriculum, not only in social studies classrooms. One consequence of the failure to address adequately the preparation of all educators, including both teachers and administrators, to fulfill their citizenship education obligations is that many do not recognize, much less fulfill, their ethical responsibilities in this area. They are, in Dewey's terms, "derelict and defaulters."

Dewey further admonishes us that the "entire structure of the school in general and its concrete workings in particular need to be considered from time to time" to be certain that it is "doing what it is called into existence to do." Based on his study of schools, Charles Silberman concluded in *Crisis in the Classroom: The Remaking of American Education* that the type of analysis Dewey called for was not occurring, with dire results. The basic problem with American education (as with, for example, journalism, television, and social work) was, Silberman said, not "incompetence or indifference or venality" on the part of educators, but a failure to think about purpose and about how technique, selection of content, and organization affect ends.

If one takes seriously reports such as came from the studies of status in precollege mathematics, science, and social studies, funded by the National Science Foundation in the late 1970s, and more recently the message of John Goodlad's *A Place Called School*, there is today reason to agree with Silberman's assessment and to re-emphasize Dewey's admonition. Such studies find little mention in schools of the civic education role of teachers outside of the social studies. Despite statements of objectives that refer to critical, logical, scientific, and/or independent thinking, ability to test hypotheses, draw conclusions, and recognize inferences—all potentially relevant to civic competence—teaching practices largely involve students in the rote learning of fixed bodies of facts and basic skills through reading textbooks, listening in class, doing worksheets, and being tested for factual recall. There is, on the part of school staffs, little consideration of or talk about the goals of education beyond subject matter skills and knowledge, and little analysis of the sort called for by Dewey.

If this condition of public schooling is to be remedied, there must be, first of all, consideration of the role of philosophy in teacher education

and our failure to educate teachers to be the thoughtful practitioners which Dewey and others have called for. If, indeed, the school is fundamentally an instrument of a democratic society, then careful reflection on the nature of that society, including its basic values, and the implications for schooling would seem to be a *sine qua non* of teacher education. Unfortunately, there is little to suggest that such is the case in practice.

If a first priority is the development of "teacher-philosophers," and that seems to fall in the domain of the humanities, then what might be the contribution of the social sciences to the civic competence of teachers? In addressing that question, it is important to consider what is and what might be. The Jeffersonian warning, loosely translated, that we should not expect to remain free if we are not educated is often taken as a statement of justification for liberal education which exposes students to the great ideas and the modes of inquiry within the major academic areas of the university. The purpose of such education is liberal in the sense of liberating—an appreciation of humanness and of the life of the mind, the opening of the mind to new ideas and ways of thinking, and its unfettering, as Charles Beard expresses in *The Nature of the Social Sciences*, from "small, provincial, local, class, group, or personal prejudices." Its civic component stresses an understanding of the historical and philosophical roots of citizenship in a democratic society. The social sciences have been considered a basic element in liberal education, and to the extent that such liberal education is now a part of the education of teachers, it must be continued.

The contributions which the social sciences can make to the liberal education of teachers seem obvious. A quick listing might include the role of history, if it is classified as a social science, in establishing a sense of continuity with the past; of economics in helping one to comprehend continuing efforts by society to structure the allocation of resources; of government and political science in understanding the complexities and subleties of institutional arrangements for making and enforcing public policy, including the elusive role of the electorate and the informal powers of political parties in our society; of anthropology in comprehending the subtle influences of culture; of sociology in understanding how social roles and social institutions affect us and the society; and of psychology in understanding how we are affected by our relationships with others as well as how the characteristics of individuals affect the social-political process. Along with basic concepts and generalizations, the modes of inquiry of scholars in the social sciences present models of critical thought which should be a significant part of liberal education. Although study of none of the social sciences, perhaps with the exception of anthropology, is likely to have the shattering

effect of that first course in philosophy, their potential contribution to a liberal education should not be minimized.

Indeed, the question is less what can prospective teachers gain from the social sciences as part of their liberal education, than how can we ensure a maximum influence of the social sciences in that education? Unfortunately, the opportunities for prospective and practicing teachers, especially those outside of the area of social studies, to be exposed to the social sciences are frequently limited.

Discussions of liberal education commonly acknowledge the threats of vocationalism and, ironically, general education. Both trends—vocationalism and general education—stem, I believe, from the inability of many, including many university educators, to appreciate the abstract goals of liberal education, and the unwillingness of those at universities to defend the goals of liberal education in the face of demands for concrete outcomes on the part of students, patrons, and—at state institutions—those who pay the taxes. The effects of vocationalism and of the emphasis on general education are so strong and pervasive that a discussion of social science in the civic education of teachers would lack reality without comment on them.

"Vocationalism" is the perspective, which has come to dominate in recent years, that the purpose of a college education is to prepare one for work, either directly or through admission to graduate study. It stands in opposition to the position that a university should prepare liberally-educated persons, individuals who can think broadly and carefully about the human existence—and, therefore, not just incidentally, respond to the broader issues of the settings within which they work, as well as learn rather quickly to handle the specific demands of those settings. Vocationalism demands the teaching of the specific knowledge and skills for particular occupations, professions, or programs of graduate study. Ironically, university programs that are "vocationalized" reduce the occupational flexibility of individuals by eliminating opportunities for the liberalizing education which should be the fundamental function of the university.

Colleges of education are no worse in their vocationalist orientation than are other professional areas—in fact, in my experience, are less so than, for example, departments of engineering which, if they had their way, often would have students take no courses not directly related to vocational preparation. Nevertheless, professional education courses often do take up a significant portion of the prospective teacher's undergraduate coursework. At Utah State University, for example, about twenty-five percent of the hours needed to graduate in secondary education are professional courses; in elementary education the percentage is about thirty-seven; and in special education about forty-three.

Some of these hours are spent in the practica and student teaching which are widely regarded as essential preservice experiences—although there is some evidence that student teaching may promote traditional teaching practices which are, in many regards, antithetical to adequate citizenship education. For those preparing to teach, the opportunities for liberal education, including non-professionally-related social science courses, are limited. Those who go into social studies education are likely to have a major in one of the social sciences, including history, and a minor in another. But for those entering other areas of teaching—mathematics, science, etc.—coursework in the social sciences, as well as in the humanities, will often amount to no more than the equivalent of a quarter or so of study, and frequently less. At USU those students take from five to sixteen quarter hours of social science outside their teaching major, and about the same number in the arts and humanities.

How to counter the emphasis on vocationalism presents a major challenge for those interested in improving the civic competence of the teaching profession. By the same token, the trend toward confounding general education with liberal education portends poorly for the civic competence of teachers. I use the term "general education" to describe a program which includes courses which are to prepare students specifically to deal with life. The words "to deal with" are crucial, because again the emphasis is on concreteness. If students are likely to encounter computers in their lives, then "computer literacy"—often banally defined—becomes a part of general education. If people get married, then a family relations course is pertinent. And, if they deal with housing and budgets, then home economics courses in budgeting, home purchasing, and decorating must be a part of general education. The immediacy of application of such courses makes them attractive to students and to the concretely-oriented public. Such courses may help students cope with specific problems they anticipate encountering; but rarely will they contribute to the freeing of the mind, in the historical sense of the liberal education—although as Silberman has noted, even technical courses can be taught with the questions in mind: "What is it to be human?" and "What is the role and purpose of knowledge?" Thus they can be liberal education, although most are clearly not. "General education" undergraduate programs include courses that would typically be labeled liberal education, but the trend toward general education courses as competitive with liberal education runs counter to the needs for civic competence in teachers.

How to increase the amount of teachers' liberal education, including that in the social sciences, is a crucial question. It is a question not easily answered, and for which answers are not easily implemented, in part because of political pressures—both in and out of the university—but

also because university professors are not themselves inclined to deal with questions of purpose and function for their own courses, much less the curriculum as a whole. To get social scientists to contemplate the role of social science in liberal education, much less in developing civic competence in teachers, and then to actually make significant changes to achieve those purposes, would be a tremendous task.

Add to this general inertia with regard to thoughtfulness about purpose and how content and structure affect purpose the problem of vested interests—for example, of social science faculty in courses as now taught, and of education faculty in the number of hours of professional education taken by undergraduates. One way to increase the time available for liberal education would be to cut back on professional education courses at the undergraduate level. Such a proposal makes sense in terms of the meaningfulness of that coursework—much of what is intended to be taught in undergraduate education courses will take on meaning only after teaching experience, and would be better reserved for graduate or inservice programs. However, university presidents, governing boards, and state legislatures are usually concerned with student credit hours per full-time equivalent faculty member, and sufficiently inclined to attach budget decisions to such figures that agreement by colleges of education to proposals for reductions in undergraduate professional coursework would be tantamount to academic suicide.

Beyond quantity, however, lie questions that are rarely addressed in regard to the specific nature of the hours spent in liberal education and social science coursework. Although it may seem paradoxical, given the definition of liberal education as an opportunity for broadening and freeing the mind, should not faculties in the social sciences and in education address the question of which courses in the social sciences should be required for teachers because they have particular potential for civic competency?

For example, at Utah State University, as noted above, an undergraduate majoring in science education takes from five to sixteen quarter hours of social science courses as part of the general education requirements. That requirement might be fulfilled with a course on managing personal finances, an introduction to business course, and a human sexuality and family relations course—hardly liberal education or preparation for civic competence. For those going into education, an introductory course in economics, an anthropology course in world cultures, and/or a course in comparative political structures would each be more pertinent and valuable. Especially in the context of the frustrating small number of hours of social science to which such a person will be exposed, the more careful selection of courses seems crucial. This is

an area where more faculty initiative is needed, not just in advising students, but in making program decisions about courses that must be taken, or about groups of courses from which selections must be made, because they are essential to the education of teachers.

Another proposal may also seem paradoxical to the more general freeing-of-the-mind intent of liberal education—that is, that a limited number of courses offered in social science departments be designed specifically for prospective teachers with the intent of enhancing their civic competence and their competence as enhancers of the civic competence of their students. If Dewey was correct that a vital part of education for citizenship is participation in a schooling institution which reflects the principles of a democratic society, then it is crucial that social science courses help teachers, and school administrators, to understand the society and to be reflective both about the ways in which their behaviors reflect that society and about the ways in which they may attempt to change the schools within which they teach so that those institutions will provide more appropriate civic education for their students. Judith A. Gillespie and Howard D. Mehlinger in a 1972 article in *Social Education* suggested, for example, that in social studies it is important that students study the school as a political institution. But first shouldn't teachers generally be aware of how the school functions as a political institution, as well as contemplative of the implications for later participation in society of what students learn as they participate in that political institution known as school?

The traditional boundaries of disciplines may have to be violated. Given the limited number of hours available, it is unrealistic to expect prospective teachers to take a course in political science on the school as a political institution, in anthropology on the culture of the school, and in sociology on the school as a social institution. However, a course on understanding the school in society—what we at Utah State University call an integrative course—could be the joint responsibility of several departments, might or might not be team taught, and could bring the basic concepts from the various social sciences to bear on the understanding of the school by teachers. This could make a significant contribution not only to the teachers' civic competence *per se*, but to their ability to function within their classrooms and their schools so as to increase the civic competence of their students. Courses designed to help teachers see the relevance of the social sciences to civic competence can still be faithful to the goals of liberal education.

Such a proposal is not new, nor is it likely to be popular, as other proposers of interdisciplinary courses have discovered, because it violates the traditional separatist nature of the disciplines and because it would require the practical application of social science concepts typi-

cally taught within disciplinary strictures. Also, considerable prior knowledge in the social sciences might have to be presumed as a basis for analysis which would take place in such a course. How to insure the appropriate prerequisite coursework, if the necessary concepts could not be introduced in the interdisciplinary course, would be a major challenge. In any event, such a course should be the responsibility of those in the social sciences, so that they bring their disciplinary concepts to bear on the school, rather than leaving it to educationists to interpret the disciplines and make applications to the school.

Civic competence involves knowledge, which is the typical content of university courses, including those in the social sciences. But, as already mentioned, another critical element of civic competence to which the social sciences are relevant is decision making. Of course, what is of interest is sound decision making, careful reflectiveness. This element of civic competence ought to be addressed more specifically by those who teach social science courses, especially those for prospective and inservice teachers.

Most courses in the social sciences purvey knowledge and pay little attention to the scholars' methods of inquiry, much less to the fundamental epistemological issues which underlie social science research. College students too often come away from their studies with the view that knowledge in the social sciences is static, and with little feeling for the variety of ways through which scholars in the social sciences attempt to validate knowledge and the problems they face in doing so.

Social science courses should address methodological and epistemological issues. Perhaps even more important, students in social science courses should see inquiry modeled and be engaged in inquiry. University professors, typically, lecture on what is known, rather than demonstrating their own engagement in inquiry or engaging the students in inquiry. For students, doing well—getting good grades—is too often a matter of taking good lecture notes, underlining significant passages in the text, memorizing both, and regurgitating canned ideas in response to questions that appear to call for thought, but really call for repetition.

It is ironic that one of the major stumbling blocks to the New Social Studies programs of the 1960s, most of which attempted to have social studies teachers engage students in social science inquiry, was that the social studies teachers themselves did not understand inquiry and lacked, in their own education, models for engaging their students in that process. Teachers' own elementary, secondary, and higher education does not prepare them either to inquire or to lead students in inquiry. This situation is not unique to the social studies and the social sciences. Curriculum development efforts in science which have attempted to emphasize inquiry have faltered on the same ground—the

lack of teachers' experience with inquiry at any level of their education. Goodlad found that teachers of all subjects "simply do not know how to teach for higher levels of thinking." Teacher education students should see social science professors engaged in thinking about as well as doing social science research, and be involved in such research as an active process of inquiry, through provocative lectures and discussions, class projects, laboratory situations, and as research project assistants—so that social science methods can have an influence on the civic competence of teachers and ultimately on those teachers' students.

The social sciences do have much to offer to citizen decision making skills and concepts. Evaluating the evidence presented for and against policy decisions is an extremely difficult task for which most people are poorly prepared, and to which social science methodology could make a significant contribution. But, to maximize that contribution, those social scientists who are willing to deal with the challenge of teaching their methods of inquiry to prospective teachers and administrators as well as to other students must also deal with the limitations of social science methodology in policy making. Public issues are in essence moral or ethical issues—questions about proper aims and actions for the society and the individuals in it—not empirical issues. Although questions of fact are significant in making adequately informed political-ethical decisions, matters of value are crucial—as has been evidenced frequently by controversies among scientists as to the policy implications of knowledge in their fields.

Clearly, this is a point at which the social sciences and the humanities should intersect. Departments of policy studies usually attempt to bridge the gap between the empirical and the philosophical. And, a course in policy studies that emphasized the difficult intertwining of factual and value issues in arriving at public policy might well be one of those required of prospective teachers. Individual social science courses, too, should address specifically the interactions between knowledge and values in making public policy, considering both the application of findings from the subject under study and the context of relevant values.

The focus so far has largely been on teacher education at the undergraduate level. That emphasis seems sensible, given that preparation to become a school administrator usually entails certification and teaching experience as prerequisites. That is, the preparation of administrators is not an undergraduate program, as is the preparation of teachers. Consequently, what is said and done in regard to the social sciences in the civic learning of teachers in undergraduate programs has direct implications for the civic education of administrators.

Graduate professional education is justifiably vocationally oriented. Of course, social science courses are still appropriate, hopefully taught

in ways to encourage insightfulness and thoughtfulness about the way in which schools enhance or impede students' civic competence. But the design of graduate social science courses especially to address the civic competence of public school educators is probably not feasible, although analysis in graduate courses of schools as political and social organizations, and of school cultures, *vis-a-vis* civic education responsibilities would be invaluable for teachers and, especially, administrators.

At the undergraduate level, liberal education ought to be a vital part of civic education for prospective teachers, and thereby for prospective administrators as well. Social science is an integral part of this liberal education. Vocationalism, which impinges on the amount of liberal education to which college students can be exposed, and general education, which trivializes liberal education through focusing on specific aspects of life which the student is likely to encounter, should be opposed. A decrease in the hours to undergraduate professional education would be appropriate; most education courses would be better taught after the student has had extended teaching experience.

Liberal education, including study of the social sciences, is important for general intellectual development, as well as for insights into the human condition in general and our society in particular. Those who teach the social sciences should consider more specifically the contributions which they can make to the civic competence of teachers and thereby to the civic competence of citizens. More careful selection of coursework to help students understand both the functioning of the democratic society and the functioning of the school in the context of that society is needed. Social science courses that assist teachers in applying social science concepts to the understanding of the school would make an important contribution to civic competence. By the same token, what is too frequently an exclusive emphasis on transmitting knowledge should be tempered by a concern with teaching about the processes of inquiry in the social sciences, providing prospective teachers with models of inquiry and with actual experiences in such inquiry. The limits of empirical methods in addressing policy issues should also be a part of social science instruction.

Social science courses could be an essential part of the liberal education that ought to provide the fundamental underpinning for the civic competence of teachers. If departments of social science would address specifically questions about how their areas of study could contribute to the civic competence of teachers, much could be accomplished. But the typical university reward system provides social science faculty with few incentives to abandon their "academically-oriented" teaching or to take time from their research and publication activities to contemplate and invigorate their contributions to the civic competence of teachers.

On a limited scale, private foundations could rouse pockets of social science faculty to such activity by luring them with grants. Deans of education could lead their faculty in the re-examination of undergraduate teacher education, and with their faculty they could, on many campuses, initiate discussions to stimulate social science faculty to consider their role in the civic competence portion of teacher education. But, the force for change with the most potential is sponsorship by enlightened university presidents, who encourage social science faculty to allocate time and effort to such activities and find ways to reward those faculty who take seriously the need to address the role of the social sciences in the civic competence of teachers. Of course, such calls for change must be set in a context of the reality of state certification requirements. Changing those requirements is difficult, but not impossible. The advocacy of fifth-year teacher education programs in recent years provides an entree for the promotion of liberal education, including education in the social sciences, for teachers by those who are concerned in universities, public schools, and the public.

• • • •

James P. Shaver is a professor and associate dean for research in the College of Education at Utah State University, Logan, Utah.

Constitutional and Legal History and the Civic Learning of Teachers and Administrators

By Paul L. Murphy

The year 1987 will mark the two-hundredth anniversary of the writing of the Constitution of the United States. This bicentennial has been anticipated with eagerness as a time for summing up the American constitutional experience, for asking why we retain a two-hundred-year-old document, what principles and values it incorporates, where it has worked, and when and how it has failed. Two professional organizations have been particularly anxious that this bicentennial be a time for cerebration, as well as celebration—the American Historical Association and the American Political Science Association. Project '87, co-sponsored by these two groups, has been functioning since the late 1970s. It has operated on a three-phase plan: first, to offer fellowship and scholarship support to underwrite new studies in the field of constitutional scholarship in history, political science, and the law; secondly, it has sought to make this set of new findings and views available as new books and articles, hopefully affording refreshing insights into the United States' experience with constitutional government; and thirdly and finally, it has sought to take the findings from such scholarship to the public. This would entail developing new school

curriculum on constitutional matters, evolving attractive ways, through lesson plans, films, film strips, and classroom presentations, to arouse interest and stimulate knowledge about the Constitution. Finally, it has sought to use the media, as well as public programs and museum exhibits, to bring constitutional themes to the broader American public.

While I have been actively involved in this project almost from the first, I have many questions about it, questions especially about whether teachers have the kind of perspective that will make constitutional study exciting and fruitful. Clearly some will need help. But more than that, we need to face the question of what we should be showcasing and highlighting in terms of teaching constitutional government and enhancing civic learning from an historical standpoint. Manfred Stanley has talked about hermeneutic education and the cultivation of students' capacities to appreciate historical memory. He also speaks of the musicality of cultural myth as eminently to be stressed. I would accept both in connection with constitutional education, but I would add my own notes of concern and caution.

The American Constitution is a great many things. It is symbol. It is myth. It is the cornerstone of our civil religion. It is reality. But many who look at it have only perceptions of what that reality is, mainly focused by, or distorted by, the lenses through which they view it, lenses inevitably ground by their own experience and their own prejudices, preconceptions, and self interest. Here a number of aspects of constitutional and legal development have to be addressed and choices have to be made as to how they are addressed, if we are to come up with something that is desirable and will achieve the purposes we are seeking.

How has the American legal and governmental system worked, and where does constitutional interpretation properly fit? Should the Supreme Court be viewed as a political science model of a policy-forming institution, or a legal model of a purely judicial institution? This is central to the approach we take with young people. Do we stress that Supreme Court justices are politicians in robes, out to achieve a set of values, and to some degree highly partisan values, using the courts as instruments? Or do we stress that the courts, and especially the Supreme Court, are neutral, are obsessed with procedure, are apolitical and detached, and are seeking generally to apply the wisdom of the past through carefully developed legal doctrines in a purely logical way to immediate cases in hand? And in this regard is history at all a guide? Is it important to stress that as a result of our decentralized, localized governmental experiment under the Articles of Confederation an important shift of public values took place—a shift from a commitment to legislative power as the central instrument of popular protection, to

a growing suspicion of unfettered legislative power and majority rule, and a new commitment to the Constitutional and fundamental law and ultimately to judicial review? This was, after all, an example of the experiential learning of the Founding Fathers and a message they left. Maybe that message can raise in students' minds intriguing questions, and even a good classroom discussion about legislative supremacy versus judicial activism, and the importance of the proper rule of law in a democratic society. So, I repeat: what do we want students to think about the Constitution and the law, and how it changes?

I have already tipped you off as to what my solution is, but let me say a bit about that before I attempt to sell it to you. While any good lawyer would tell you immediately that I was totally off base, I feel that the human circumstances in which constitutional law has been shaped are a vitally important dimension of understanding how that law was shaped and why it was shaped the way it was. Admittedly it is hard to win lawsuits with historical, contextual material, but the audience we are trying to reach here is neither judge nor jury. Further, the purpose we are seeking is to produce better understanding of people's civic responsibility and how best to assume it. How do we bring home to those young people being taught the realities that affect them and what they can do to deal with those realities? I would not disenthrall us from the past, but would rather use it to better understand the present.

I am continually pleased and impressed with the ability of students to see in historical episodes the same kind of human problems, the same kind of human frailties, the same searching for workable solutions that mark contemporary problem-solving. When James Otis arose in a Boston courtroom in 1761 to protest against British troops breaking into and searching private homes and places of business with only a general search warrant, he was addressing a problem which has proved to be in no way time-bound. I was curious that in teaching my legal history course at the University of Minnesota, as we worked our way through that old case, regarding those writs of assistance, and examined its implications and overtones, students immediately, with no prompting from me, said: that is almost the same situation, with some minor differences, as is currently before the Supreme Court regarding searching the high school girl's purse by the school principal in New Jersey—*New Jersey* v. *T. L. O., a Juvenile.*

This, I believe, underlines to a certain extent another of Stanley's points. The potential value of exploring the civic possibilities of local historical research is great, if it is not done in a preachy way, or in a judgmental way, by either using the episode to hail or blast cultural pluralism, pass judgment on the sins (or the glories) of the fathers, or reduce the history to some kind of psychological argument of either a

moralistic or economic sort. If it is done right, the story speaks for itself. Further, the nice thing about the past episode is that you have do have a conclusion. You do know how it came out. You do know, in this instance, that as John Adams said some years later about Otis' case: "There and then the child independence was born." You also know that even though Otis lost his case, the loss itself galvanized Americans to eventually add a Fourth Amendment to their Constitution, guaranteeing our citizenry against unreasonable search and seizure. And the fact that that amendment, adopted in the 1790s, is the basis for a case involving searching a school girl's purse today suggests that the Constitution is a living organism which can be, and often is, very successfully readapted to the changing circumstances of the American people.

Or take John Adams, himself. Jefferson and Washington and Franklin apparently had far better public relations firms handling their accounts and historic images. Adams has come down to us as dour and uncharismatic. Yet he was a man of principle. But also, he was a man who was concerned that values like liberty and freedom had to be seen as workable and responsible when applied to human situations. Further, he was anxious to stress that it was the citizen's responsibility to make them work honestly and fairly. Following the Boston Massacre in March of 1770, with the town of Boston up in arms against the British troops who had panicked and fired into a group of demonstrating Americans and killed several, Adams feared what was going to happen in the name of liberty and freedom. Boston mobs of "Liberty Boys" were prepared to do virtually anything for the patriot cause. Adams, as a true patriot, was rapidly moving to the recognition that independence was going to come. This was the only way to protect American liberty. But at the same time, he was innately conservative and cautious, and was convinced that too much vigilantism in the name of liberty was going to so discredit the patriot cause that it would frighten responsible people, here and abroad, from supporting that cause. These militant people, while Adams would not deny their value as enthusiasts, were not the kind of people who inspired many cautious patriots with an ability to offer constructive, positive, alternative leadership to that of the British. The patriot cause had to be a responsible cause, and to be responsible it had to concern itself carefully with liberty through the law. Thus, Adams was determined that the British captain and the British troops involved in the Boston Massacre were going to have a fair trial. If these unpopular people were tried fairly, and the innocent acquitted, he felt it would be apparent that Boston placed law above prejudice, partisanship, and mob rule. Therefore, he volunteered to defend the British soldiers—a very unpopular stand for an upwardly mobile young attorney trying to build a practice. In doing so, he sounded

another cry. Here the imagery is important. This was the cry: "Liberty and justice for all!" Every accused person, however heinous the crime, had a right to counsel, a right to the guarantees of a fair trial, and a right to be tried in an atmosphere of objectivity. Further, Adams lost no chance to point out that this was the American way. American freedom and justice was true justice, in contrast with English justice which would never have recognized such general and natural rights in the citizenry.

Students like this story. So do professors. Because, to a degree, Adams was trying—in a somewhat didactic way—to integrate the content of concepts like liberty and justice into desirable behavioral patterns. In other words, he was stressing the civic obligation to apply such concepts, and to do so fairly responsibly.

One of James P. Shaver's notions also struck this old history professor well. This was his suggestion that the purpose of civic education is to stress an understanding of the historical and philosophical roots of citizenship in a democratic society. This again underlines both a need and a challenge, but does so persuasively. Why, as my students sometimes ask, should we get involved in the political process? What is the payoff? This is a hard question to answer briefly and quickly. It is a particularly hard question when the assumption always is that there are powerful and elite people, with access to money, to the media, and to policy makers generally, who will and do take care of a variety of the issues which we feel must be addressed.

I have been both intrigued and depressed recently in reading Herbert McCloskey and Alida Brill's study *Dimensions of Tolerance: What Americans Believe about Civil Liberties*. The bottom line of this study seems to be, somewhat troublingly, that conditions for democracy depend not upon the citizenry, but on their leaders. Elites, they conclude, will maintain our basic civil liberties, and citizen responsibility in this area is thus to support those elites. What would the Founding Fathers have said? Jefferson once observed: "Every government degenerates when trusted to the rulers alone." He argued further: "The people, therefore, are the only safe depositories. The influence over government must be shared among all the people. If every individual participates, the government will be safe." John Jay, one of the far more conservative authors of the *Federalist Papers*, agreed: "Every member of the state ought diligently to read and study the constitution of his country, and teach the rising generation to be free. By knowing their rights, they will sooner perceive when they are violated and be the better prepared to defend and assert them."

But I am painfully aware that I am simplifying some complex issues. So let me return to the general issue for a moment. What do you want us to teach the teachers and administrators about the American constitu-

tional process? McCloskey and Brill argue that tolerance is acquired mainly through social learning, which involves three stages: exposure to a given set of norms, the comprehension of those norms, and their acceptance or internalization. Yet even this constitutes a certain type of value judgment, and one which may not be the right one to teach. McCloskey and Brill write as if the norms are a given and unchangeable part of the American constitutional tradition, much as the Ten Commandments are given to the Judeo-Christian tradition—just out there to be comprehended and internalized. At the same time they also argue that many particular civil liberties are neither specified in the Constitution or firmly rooted in tradition. They further suggest that people who are exposed to civil libertarian norms will accept those norms just because they are correct. But this ignores, in a distressing kind of way, the fact that civil libertarian norms often conflict with other norms and values involving the family, national unity, national security, religion, and standards of personal behavior.

This raises some troubling questions. Are norms things to be discovered and absorbed? Or are they really socially constructed—made and modified by human agents? Should we be teaching that law is a series of absolutes; or that law is a social process reflecting the needs and requirements of the community, and that law should thus draw upon pragmatic past experience in order best to address those needs? This poses a further interesting dilemma. If teachers are to teach students norms—the "Decalogue" proposed by R. Freeman Butts in "The Revival of Civic Learning Requires a Prescribed Curriculum" in the Winter 1982 issue of *Liberal Education*, for example—will this produce active civic participation? Or possibly wouldn't that participation come more readily from a slightly less ponderous view which suggests that law, and especially constitutional law (the most politicized branch of law), needs continual public input and public direction? It also needs people able to draw upon past experience as well, to make it work better.

If this is the case, obligations are very different. Responsibilities are very much more pointed. The type of participation we urge will obviously be very different as well. What we need to do, then, is to come to terms with that which we need to do. On that score I think that the social sciences have to get their own house in order and talk not only about content, but also a complementary division of labor and the proper role of each in that division. History has duties and opportunities here, both to participate and at the same time to hold down its complaints when the most effective path may entail some needed dehistoricization.

• • • •

Paul L. Murphy is with the Department of History at the University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota.

101

Evidence for Balancing Content with Process and Balancing Answers with Questions: The Contribution of Psychology to the Civic Education of Teachers

By Judith Torney-Purta

The role of social science content in the improvement of civic education is beyond dispute and has been treated extensively previously. The role of the processes which social scientists study—classroom processes and individual psychological processes—is not as obvious and receives less attention. I shall specifically address the contribution of psychology to the civic education of teachers by arguing that it is essential to understand the processes involved in civic learning. I will present evidence for the importance of classroom discussion prompted by questions as a balance to lectures and texts which provide answers. I will present evidence from recent psychological research regarding the cognitive-developmental processes which mediate civic learning for students and for teachers.

When attempts by educators and policy makers to emphasize the content of the curriculum have resulted in simplistic approaches to defining civic consciousness, those attempts have either been of little value or counterproductive. The examination of state mandates by J. Hennings and his colleagues in 1979 and by L. Edelman a few years

earlier indicates that the approved content of civic education in the United States is patriotism, anti-communism, and—in a number of states—support for free enterprise. Little attention is paid in these mandates to the skills necessary for political participation or to the understanding of diverse views. Teacher education responds to the need to carry out these mandates. In what is sometimes called "the transmission ideology of education," it is assumed that the answers to all questions likely to arise in the process of governing have been decided; the novice teacher merely needs to learn these answers so as to be able to transmit them to students.

R. Freeman Butts in *The Revival of Civic Learning* has provided a compelling critique of simplistic approaches to civic education which assume an unambiguous meaning for essential values. For example, it is no longer sufficient to argue that civic education must simply inculcate support for freedom or privacy. For many, freedom has come to mean "no one can tell me what to do," while respect for privacy means "no one can ask me to justify my behavior." Some recent data on youth attitudes support Butts' conclusion about corruptions in the meaning of civic values. In a 1981 survey of 1,000 Pennsylvania high school seniors, R. Sigel and M. Hoskin found that many defined freedom as meaning that one could do whatever one wanted without interference from the government; they relied on slogans when asked to define democracy. Few students had an understanding of the application of democratic principles in solving political conflicts.

That democratic civic consciousness cannot be promoted by enchancing content alone is suggested by the findings of the IEA Civic Education Survey, conducted by myself and a number of colleagues, in which more than 30,000 students were surveyed in 1971 in ten countries including the United States. The use of rote methods of learning and the stress on practice of patriotic ritual were correlated negatively with both knowledge of civics and support for democratic attitudes across countries. No country was successful in educating students to simultaneously score high on scales measuring civic knowledge, support for democratic values, support for national government, and interest in civic participation. Further, there was little discernible relation between patterns of performance on the cognitive civics sub-tests and the content topics stressed in civics classes.

There is, however, some evidence for the value of content courses in social sciences at the university level available from a re-analysis of the Global Awareness Survey, originally conducted by ETS and the Council on Learning with college freshmen and seniors. One of the most widely-quoted findings of that survey was the low scores on the test of knowledge of global issues achieved by education majors. In a re-

analysis, when I held constant measures of academic ability such as SAT and ACT scores, number of history and geography courses taken became a positive predictor of the knowledge score for all students. The experience of integrating the content of a discipline, indexed by majoring in history or social science, made an important contribution to success on the test, even when the number of courses taken was held constant. In another analysis which partialed out factors such as number of social science courses and academic ability, the difference between education majors and other majors was diminished but not eliminated. At the university or college level, both the information provided in courses and the opportunity to integrate that information with a major in the social sciences enhance global awareness.

In a study of secondary school students which I conducted using a shortened form of the ETS questionnaire, the number of years a student had taken social studies was a predictor of the score on the global awareness test. However, there was some indication that courses which took a very traditional approach to world history made no difference, while courses which were organized around the study of international relations had a positive impact.

Attempts to foster classroom processes which encourage open discussion and questioning have been shown empirically to promote civic knowledge and democratic attitudes. There is considerable evidence that students learn to value rights of self expression, to respect other persons, and to consider several points of view before making up their mind on issues from the way that schools embody values like these in their organization, teaching, and social climate. In the IEA civic education project, the extent to which secondary school teachers respected students' opinions and allowed them to express those opinions in class was a consistent positive predictor of more knowledge of civics and of less authoritarian attitudes. Using IEA data from the United States in a more detailed analysis, it was found the following two aspects of classroom climate were the most significant predictors of tolerance for democratic dissent in political life: students reporting that knowing the causes or explanations of events was more important than memorizing names or dates in social studies classes, and students reporting that they frequently brought up current events for discussion in class. Similar factors were important in West Germany.

Using classroom observation and some of the IEA attitude scales, W. Hawley in 1976 conducted a study of classroom climate in nearly 80 fifth-grade classrooms in the United States. Teachers who paid attention to the opinions expressed in class, as measured by both student perceptions and outside observers, had students who expressed more

interest in the ideas of others. An extensive evaluation of law-related education programs in 1981 by R. Hunter and M. J. Turner, in which they used knowledge and attitude tests, interviews with teachers and administrators, behavior reports from students, and classroom observations at nineteen sites, suggests the specific value of discussion of topics about which some controversy exists and in which both positive and negative information about the legal system is presented. After an extensive review of political socialization research, L. Ehman in 1980 concluded that the most positive contribution a teacher at any level could make to the acquisition of democratic values was to foster a classroom process which gave students freedom to express their opinions. This was more important than any particular curriculum content.

In an empirical study which compared controversy with consensus seeking in classrooms, sixth grade students were assigned to three learning groups each of which studied the same controversial issues. As K. Smith and colleagues report from this 1981 study, in the "controversy group" pro and con sides were assigned. In the "consensus" group students were told that they could study the issues in any way they wanted but were advised to avoid arguing. In the "individualistic" group students studied the material without interacting with others. When compared with the concurrence group and the individualistic group, those in the controversy group demonstrated higher achievement and retention, greater search for information, more accurate understanding of different perspectives on the issue, and more positive attitudes toward controversy and toward their classmates. A recent review of research by D. W. Johnson and R. T. Johnson suggests that the constructive use of controversy in the classroom has the potential to increase "epistemic curiosity," to enhance the ability to understand others' perspectives, and to increase the quality of problem solving. The studies spanned the elementary through college years.

A study conducted with college students in 1980 by M. Jackson, evaluating a semester-long political skills course focusing on such things as coalition building, communication, and crisis management, found that it succeeded in making students' perceptions of decision-making more realistic.

In summary, one can find few studies supporting a stress on factual content alone, more supporting classroom processes which include discussion, controversy, and integration. There is considerable evidence that helping students ask and find answers to questions taking several points of view is advantageous, while simply giving them the answers is not. For those preparing to teach, this means that acquiring skills of question-asking and classroom-climate-assessment may be critical.

A balance between concern for discussion processes in the classroom and concern for content is the best approach to improving civic learning. Some have expressed concern about the direction of this balance, believing that an overemphasis on process and controversy in the past two decades resulted in a neglect of citizens' obligations in a democracy. In 1979 Janowitz, with the assistance of colleagues at several universities, surveyed approximately 1,500 students concerning their attitudes to nine rights and nine obligations associated with citizenship, and found that no civic obligation was rated as important as any one of the four traditional political rights. He notes the anomaly that "the right to vote is rated higher than the duty to vote; the right to a speedy trial by jury is considered more important than the obligation to serve on a jury." He continues:

> There can be no effective civic consciousness and no sense of political obligation unless members of the popular citizenry have a realistic and meaningful sense of nationalism ... compatible with the realities of the contemporary interdependent world community.

He stresses answers as well as questions and the inculcation of moral sentiments supportive of democracy as well as critical abilities.

Analysis of programs such as the Political Literacy Project, developed over the past decade in Great Britain, has suggested that the content of civic values—freedom, toleration, fairness, respect for truth, and respect for reasoning—cannot be separated from the process by which the teacher helps students to see things from the point of view of others, to be critical about sources of political information, and to recognize political dimensions in school or on the job, as well as in Parliament. In schools where this program has been successful, it can largely be attributed to the training of teachers who have the background to create a classroom climate in which the content and process of civic values are congruent.

A serious problem with a stress on process and an open climate for classroom questioning is the enormous difficulty of preparing teachers for this activity. Dan Lortie in *Schoolteacher: A Sociological Analysis* concludes, after an extensive analysis of teachers, that as a professional group they show little ability to reflect analytically on their practice. Other research has indicated that many teachers reason about political issues at levels which are very similar to those of their students. Learning to conduct discussions in which students feel free to express opinions and are also able to make realistic evaluations of them has been found to be one of the most difficult parts of teacher training.

In general, it is much easier to be critical of educational practice than it is to formulate and successfully implement reform, especially in areas such as civic education. My own recent review of the tensions between parent control and professional control of civic education suggests that many teachers are avoiding criticism of their practices by sticking to questions with simple factual answers and not promoting discussions because it may be misinterpreted by parents who believe that questions asked in school should have single correct answers.

A view of the educational process as one in which teachers "set up a dialogue in which the learner can reshape his knowledge through interaction both with others and with subjects seen as resources" is referred to by R. Meighan in *A Sociology of Educating* as the "interactive ideology." That is one way of approaching an optimal balance between content and process.

Psychological processes at the individual level, such as developmental sequences and learning principles, are being recognized as mediators of the understanding of social and civic matters in democracy. Countries with authoritarian systems rely on indoctrination which can relatively easily be adapted to different levels of students. In democracies successful civic education must take account of students' ability to understand abstract principles. H. Durio in 1976 discussed the subtle connection between statutes which protect citizens' freedom of expression and values held by citizens which relate to the exercise of these freedoms. For example, statutes protecting access to information are essential in democracy but must be associated with individuals' taking responsibility for informed decision making through the critical study of political information. She relies upon Bandura's social learning theory, especially its stress on models and self-monitoring of behavior, as follows:

> The process of constructing or abstracting political principles is limited by cognitive level, but the value placed on the democratic content of principles is influenced by social learnings. In addition, there are undoubtedly individual personality variables that affect all behavior in the social realm ... Successful democratic socialization is a function of adequate social sensitivity, exposure to democratic models, and formal operational skills which foster the individual's construction of social principles.

Such an approach to civic education in a democracy, using psychological theory in an integrated way, is relatively new. A decade earlier, one could justify the inapplicability of social learning theory because of its mechanistic treatment giving little attention to children's understand-

ing of their own behavior. Similarly, until recently the application of Piagetian principles to social phenomena was limited to research on moral development in a personal rather than a social context.

Within the past few years psychologists have increasingly focused on the way young people integrate their knowledge about social institutions with prior information and concepts. The essence of the developmental process is its stress on the child's active participation in the process of constructing knowledge about social processes and institutions by collecting information and trying out ideas. Although it is impossible to manipulate an institution in the way one would manipulate a lump of clay, the child can experiment in a playful way with ideas about the economic or political system. H. Furth in 1979, in a study of children's views of the economic system, found that during an interview about buying and selling, interviewers often saw children trying out partly formulated ideas and assessing their reasonableness. This is an example of the developmental process in action.

J. Adelson and R. O'Neil in 1966 noted the emergence of concern for the public welfare as a balance to concern for individual rights during adolescence. E. A. Peel in 1971 suggested that only during late adolescence do most young people who are asked to interpret a social situation become capable of drawing upon material outside of what is given in the statement of the situation itself. However, some very recent research suggests that elementary school children instructed in a specific way may be able to go beyond the information given, at least in simple tasks. Essays were compared from two fourth grade classes—one where the teacher practiced an ideology labeled "academic," stressing reproduction of material and conformity to authority; and one where the teacher's ideology was labeled "cognitive-developmental," stressing an interpretation of current material in light of past experience. P. Mosenthal reports in 1984 that students in the cognitive-developmental class were more likely to move beyond the concrete material given to integrate it in a meaning structure with prior knowledge and to infer motivation. Other recent work on these topics has included R. Leahy's 1983 research on young people's views of social class and my own consideration of connections between concepts of injustice and views of the role of social institutions in promoting human rights in the Leahy volume.

Recent research has also pinpointed developmental phases when civic values seem especially open to educational influence. A review of research which I conducted on perspective taking and other social cognitive processes suggests that the age period which begins at about eight is particularly important. Many children of this age are able to view the world from the point of view of others and are interested in

people who have ideas which may differ from their own. At about twelve or thirteen, conformity to peer group values becomes paramount, and the child is often less open to diversity. O. Stevens has conducted small group interviews with British children and describes in 1982 the "unconscious vitality" they bring to issues with civic and political content. She also observed a spurt in the ability to articulate political ideas at about age nine. It takes skilled teacher preparation to take full advantage of this readiness by using the cognitive-developmental approach rather than merely transmitting factual information, however. There is certainly a place in the early years of elementary school for stress on basic content and basic democratic values, such as postive national feeling and respect for others. By the time most children are nine or ten, they appear to be ready for instruction which raises alternatives and promotes discussion and inquiry.

Many teachers in training are late adolescents themselves; they are in a developmental period which may exert constraints on their preparation for civics instruction. In 1981 W. Perry, after extensive study, noted in a book edited by Chickering the tendency for college students to move through several positions with respect to their ways of resolving cogni tive and ethical issues. At the dualism level, the student is interested in pitting good against bad and in finding the "right answer" for ethical as well as intellectual problems. Appeals to authority justify choices. Such a position would certainly predispose the prospective teacher to prefer the factual transmission model of civic education discussed earlier. According to Perry, after moving through a period of almost total relativism in value judgments, many college students arrive at commitment to a value position made with the awareness of differing views; they become willing to take responsibility for their own choices. Students at this level of development might be ready to adopt an interactive model balancing questions and answers.

In summary, developmental processes at the individual level create both opportunities and difficulties for teachers' civic education. The problems of civic education in this country will not be solved by an exclusive concentration on strengthened social science content either in teacher education or in the school curriculum. Considering content alone may have a number of unintended negative consequences—stifling free discussion, encouraging students to stick with the information given, narrowing the range of opinion they understand, and failing to promote motivation to be involved in the public life. I suggested several promising directions in my 1983 article on this topic in the *Journal of Teacher Education*—in particular, assisting teachers to do research in their own classrooms appears to be a way of making them more reflective about their practice, helping them relate content more

effectively to process, and giving their students a model of someone doing social science inquiry. There is also potential in the other suggestions made in that article—giving teacher trainees experience in interviewing children so that they may gain firsthand knowledge of developmental progress in social thought and making teaching trainees more attentive to socialization experiences which have shaped their own understanding of civic life. But by themselves these activities are probably insufficient. Many individuals in this country who are trying to stimulate reflective understanding on the part of teachers are discouraged by the view on the part of those who shape school policy that content is the only important facet of civic learning and that the answers alone are more important than a discussion of the questions. At the present time even in situations where an interactive or cognitive-developmental ideology of teaching might flourish, a transmission model is seen as safer and is followed.

There are therefore two themes which should be explicitly recognized or even stressed in our efforts in this area. Understanding the role of classroom process and individual psychological process in civic education is one such theme. The social science disciplines, including psychology, have a great deal to contribute to understanding the balance between content and process; research reviews and new research as well as program development are needed in this area. A second theme is more closely related to the political and social context of civic education. How is it possible to present process concerns to make them more acceptable to communities and school boards? These are the groups outside the universities and teacher training institutions which shape day-to-day practice in schools and thereby shape the education of teachers for those schools. These are the two major themes suggested by this analysis of the contribution of psychological research and theory to the civic learning of teachers.

• • • •

Judith Torney-Purta is a professor of human development with the Department of Human Development and the Institute for Child Study, College of Education, University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland.

Discussion at Third General Session

Discussion following the four presentations at the third general session focused particularly on considerations of improved dialogue and cooperation between the various disciplines, departments, and schools and colleges involved in the preparation of teachers and other educational personnel. In response to the concerns raised by James P. Shaver about the expansive professional education requirements on his campus, several participants in the seminar noted that in their states and on their campuses there were extremely restrictive requirements concerning the number of professional courses that students may take in professional education.

Fourth General Session: What Should Schools of Education Contribute to the Civic Learning of Teachers and Administrators?

The fourth general session of the seminar was moderated by Robert L. Saunders. The focus for this session was the question: What should schools or departments of education contribute to the civic learning of the teaching profession?

The primary presentation on this question was made by Richard E. Gross, followed by responses prepared by Charles A. Tesconi, Jr., and Faustine C. Jones-Wilson.

Needed Decisions in the Civic Education of Teachers: An Agenda for Action

By Richard E. Gross

The last several years have brought a burgeoning expansion of public and professional concerns over citizenship education to a degree never experienced since the era of World War II. The myriad of publications, conferences, and meetings devoted to this topic could practically clog a computer! With all of the resulting pontifical statements, lists of concerns, and strident recommendations, one is led to expect a near renaissance in civic education. But such has not occurred. As we continue to examine varying facets of the topic, we now focus on the teacher and his or her education as a teacher towards helping buttress the still shaky and inconclusive school programs and efforts in this most consequential area.

I will provide some guidelines and specific examples of what schools of education and teacher training may contribute to the civic preparation of teachers. However, I wish to begin by disclaiming a really major role in that citizenship effort by schools and departments of education. I will outline a number of problems which now reduce the effectiveness of what teacher education can accomplish here, factors which, in turn, delimit the contributions of elementary and secondary school teachers

in promoting good citizenship. My emphasis will be upon an agenda of essential decisions, many of which, of necessity, are preliminary to the development of successful programs for teachers' civic education.

1) We need a clear-cut and generally agreed upon definition of citizenship education. In reading the literature one finds that individuals and groups view citizenship education in considerable diversity—from a relatively narrow emphasis upon political education to a very broad conception of content that reflects aims practically parallel to the overall goals of schooling. Therefore, we do need a specific delimitation of the area. This will enable the identification of appropriate content, skills, and attitudes upon which teachers should concentrate their civic education efforts. Typically, anything "good" or "righteous" qualifies; thus, we have a blurred and overloaded field.

2) A second problem is the confusion between the citizenship education program of the schools and the social studies curriculum. Often the two seem to be viewed as synonymous. While they do share many objectives, there are elements from history and the social sciences which, in my opinion, may not be very directly related to citizenship education as I conceive it. Additionally, the entire school—administrators and all teachers at each grade level—have responsibilities here. We may conceive of the social studies as providing a core of civic learning; but the good citizen is the responsibility and product of the entire educational enterprise.

3) Once we have reached agreement and delineation on the foregoing, we must look realistically at the total job of the school. It is imperative that we decide on just what and how much can normally be accomplished. New as well as continuing problems in society bring increasing demands upon the school. What are the specific and fundamental responsibilities of formal education in the area of citizenship? Our previously agreed-upon definition, once accomplished, will help here immensely. What elements in accruing social demands are the appropriate responsibilities of other institutions? Which can be shared with community organizations? Which should be primarily the responsibility of the family? Schools and educators have been too willing to assume responsibilities for which they are unprepared and ill-positioned. Underlying these demands are the striking changes in American society, particularly the dissolution of traditional family organizational roles, which have cast increasingly difficult challenges on the already over-burdened school program. Indeed, sometimes I am led to consider that we educators should spend less time with children and more time with parents and adults in wrestling with these issues.

4) Having come to some understanding of limits and mutual responsibilities, educators next have to identify prime specifics on the basic

topics and issues which they are going to emphasize in their instruction. Called for here is the identification of "essentials." This detailing of academic content and other civic learnings in the school is very important because children and especially older youth are too often turned off or bored by conventional subject matter that they perceive as irrelevant as well as uninteresting. A typical civic prescription, for example, calls for an emphasis upon American heroes and heroines. There are ways to spark life into the contributions of the famous and not-so-famous so as to help build the attitudes we seek; but, while thorough research is lacking, traditional employment of biography seems to contribute little to pupil growth in the patriotic realm. This holds true for other cherished content frequently recommended. We must try to better ascertain that what we teach is truly vital and attainable and then see to it that we reach these goals.

5) So we are led to the instructional challenge. How shall the school and the teacher best approach the content to be taught? It is clear that the means we employ can assure or negate the attainment of our purposes. Thus, appropriate and potentially enervating subject matter frequently becomes lackluster as a result of trite methodology. Serious attention should be devoted to planning motivational approaches to instruction that are congruent with aims and content, as well as with pupil abilities and needs.

We do know from long-standing experience and research that worthy civic attitudes are attained via the following channels: (1) Democratic qualities are definitely learned through participation in activities where children and youth can practice democracy; (2) These civic attributes can also be learned by traditional intellectual content and processes, but these cannot be depended upon alone; (3) Emotional appeals can result in the promotion of democratic ideals; (4) Personality factors such as intelligence, inclinations towards social activity, and a positive estimate of one's own efficacy are examples of qualities which can promote positive civic ideals and actions; (5) A goodly amount of both civic information and civic attitudes is attained unconsciously from family, associates, and peer groups in a kind of "social osmosis"; the influence of mass media is pervasive here also; (6) Teachers and schools as models of positive civic qualities are probably more important in helping develop such understandings and beliefs than is the subject matter they stress; (7) Economic well-being and a satisfactory standard of living would seem to be fundamental as a base if individuals are expected to accept and follow out on the positive civic qualities society wishes to instill; (8) Democratic attitudes and understandings are products of good mental health; a stable emotional development as well as home, school, and community conditions without extreme tensions

are very important in the attainment of positive qualities of citizenship.

The aforementioned provide a base upon which we can plan more effective courses and learning experiences. However, there are further considerations for teacher educators and academicians to consider in evolving the best possible curriculum for citizenship for aspiring teachers. Unfortunately, we do not have certain answers to these prime questions, but they require thoughtful attention, further research, and then parallel adjustments in educational programs and approaches. The questions are:

a. Are civic attitudes built primarily by the kinds of experiences we shape for children and/or to what degree are these developmentally dependent; and if so, which and when? Sound answers here would bring about a thorough reshaping of many programs.

b. To what extent are civic qualities instilled through an initial base of fundamental factual knowledge and/or to what extent can this knowledge be attained as well or even better by gaining and applying it during the process of issue-study and problem-resolution? This is still a very debatable topic between many progressives and traditionalists.

c. How can the school best utilize and cooperate with other pertinent vehicles for civic experience in the enveloping community outside of the school? It would seem that certain of the wider aspects of citizenship education can be reached only where systematic, mutual efforts of concerned individuals and groups reinforce one another.

d. This is a dual query. In planning for civic education, what and how much should be independently focused and what and how much should be met in group experiences? Which elements of the citizenship education program should emphasize the individual and which should reflect social rights and responsibilities? How can increasingly specialized student concerns be blended with the essential and pervasive national values? Limited research on group work, for example, reveals that it does result in increased pupil altruism and helpfulness and that if well structured it can reduce prejudice. Can we evolve a balance of individually oriented learnings with appropriate group activities that meet effectively both personal and social expectations which frequently come into conflict in human relationships?

e. What content and related approaches are particularly important for the increasing number of minority students, many of whom have good reasons for societal alienation? Which are most appropriate for the many deprived children in our public schools? And, where we have a large influx of new immigrants, what special considerations are in order? Reflected here are grave problems which beset both rural and urban schooling.

From policy-making bodies to individual teachers, we cannot wait for

definitive research to act on urgent queries such as the foregoing. The information available should be probed and carefully analyzed, including our subjective views that result from our own experiences, and then we should begin accordingly to revise our civic education programs for teachers. Even though somewhat tentative and dependent upon further investigation, the best possible answers to these and other such questions posed about citizenship education need to be identified and acted upon now.

Eventually a rather massive, broad-based, and continuing set of coordinated efforts to improve citizenship aspects of teacher education should be mounted. Parallel reform of civic education in the schools could then be anticipated. Meanwhile, certain of the immediate decisions require less of a research base than they do a collegial, open-minded atmosphere of cooperative decision-making. Who, for example, shall be primarily responsible for the civic knowledge and the social and political competencies of the teacher? In terms of his or her personal scholastic development, how much can be expected from the limited number of hours and courses that the prospective mentors spend with their education professors, readings, and assignments? No doubt these can be redesigned, better focused, and otherwise strengthened. But it is time to stop placing so much of the blame for teacher inadequacies in this area upon professional educators and their programs. Without any doubt, the major responsibilities here lie with the social science and liberal arts faculties who, over time, have a more significant impact than the educationists, particularly at the secondary school training level.

Undoubtedly improved civic education can be expected from general reforms in teacher education, such as raising acceptance levels for teacher preparation to 2.75 or 3.00 on a 4.00 scale and by more stringent professional quality ascertainment measures. Equally important, of course, would be materially strengthened and enlarged subject matter credentialing requirements by colleges and universities, as well as by state legislation; so too, measures that would force school administrators to employ only properly credentialled personnel in the various positions calling for particular knowledge.

Returning to the influence of largely specialized academics, there is the question as to how we can influence their selection of content and the emphases in their instruction to feature the important general education and "liberating" aspects of their subjects that are not only important for future teachers, but especially at the undergraduate level, for the majority of their students. Here one is led to consider the proposition that one of the great tragedies in the historical evolution of teacher education was the death rather than the strengthening of the

normal schools wherein academicians knew the career goals of their students and were expected to so select and teach the basic content of their courses.

Another example of a needed curriculum decision that should have direct impact upon recommended programs of study for future teachers—and, again, for many other students—relates to the extent to which citizenship education programs should be primarily nationally oriented. In a formal and political sense, the realization of the idea of global citizenship remains far ahead of us. Who can question the predominant influence of nationalism in so many aspects of world affairs today? Yet all of us are experiencing and are being led to recognize our increasing global interdependencies. What elements of the civic learning experiences of teachers should have global foci? Indeed, how can the survival of certain national values and traditions even be maintained without such global insights? At the other extreme of political "savvy" and action lie the local school, neighborhood, and community. This is where students and teachers can be directly involved. This is where rather immediate and personal learning experiences can be shaped readily. To what degree should the civic education of youth and, therefore, teachers be so directed? It seems to me that key social and political understandings may be best exemplified and learned in programs that give considerable attention to the more immediate local, state, and regional aspects of citizenship.

I have sampled some of the issues that call for more research, for needed decisions, and for detailed planning and organization. We have had enough decrying of the civic irresponsibility of youth, of ill-informed charges against teachers and their professional education, of short-sighted cries for a return to old-fashioned inculcation of facts and beliefs, and of platitudinous panaceas. Can our mutual sense of urgency be joined to bring about an agreed-upon prioritization for cooperative action rather than more complaints and acrimonious charges?

In conclusion I offer several final thoughts on our topic. We certainly do have to provide teachers with an understanding of the great ideas in the evolution of human freedom and justice. They need to appreciate the dedication of participants in this struggle. They need to know reasons for the blockages to fruition and progress, as well as to understand the vital importance of the continuing efforts of citizens who understand and act upon their rights and responsibilities.

Secondly, in addition to what we may gain from history, essential elements in providing key socio-civic knowledge accrue from the related social sciences, the humanities, and, in our technological age, from science. As with the preceding, the bulk of this matter is not the

responsibility of teacher educators but must be included in the total program of teacher education. With all the subject matter competencies needed, such a program demands at least five years of tailored work. Intending teachers should be urged and helped to commit themselves to the career by the junior year; but instead of a major in education they should be provided with several early trial instructional experiences, culminating in a fifth year internship in cooperating local schools.

Thirdly, all academicians responsible for the undergraduate courses for teachers need to properly emphasize the procedures of their disciplines. One of the great faults of much undergraduate education is the lecture format of merely imparting the subject. It is here, over four years, where future lower-school teachers "learn" how to teach—too often in the boring manner that tends to so dull youthful interest and initiative. In my own case, as a student at a major American university with one of the notable history departments in the nation, I was not really exposed to the methods of history until into my master's degree program. All mentors of future teachers need to emphasize the means by which knowledge is gained and by which wise conclusions, compromises, and decisions are made. A long-departed but well-remembered philosophy professor of mine, Max Otto, called this approach through controversy involvement in "the American way at life" in contrast to the unfortunate attempts by so many instructors to merely impart the American way of life.

Fourthly, by approaching their subject matter and classes in the above-mentioned manner, instructors exemplify the characteristics of my final recommendation for teachers' civic education. In featuring process and not product, they help mold the open-minded, inquiring individual so important to a free society. However, in all aspects of their relationships with students, teachers need—above all—to be sound models. And it is not only the teacher and his or her classroom that should exemplify the values and ways of our society; but, to the extent possible, the school itself should reflect the virtuous qualities of humanity. It is a sad contradiction that in the workshops of civic apprenticeship, learners too frequently experience conditions of authoritarianism and near-incarceration.

As I have illustrated, considerable rethinking, discussion, cooperation, modifications, and compromise are in order; in my opinion, truly effective citizenship education for teachers will not occur until we have largely resolved the issues presented in this complex and demanding agenda. Since time does not wait upon us, now where do we start and how shall we go about it?

• • • •

Richard E. Gross is a professor with the School of Education, Stanford University, Stanford, California.

Essential Decisions and Consensus

By Charles A. Tesconi, Jr.

Richard E. Gross presents an agenda of "essential decisions" which he regards as a necessary first order of business in the development of successful civic education programs for teachers. I will review these decisions briefly, while noting what I regard as a fundamental problem revealed upon consideration of each or most of these decisions. I hope to make the point that Gross's "essential decisions" cannot be executed satisfactorily until this problem is addressed and ameliorated.

Gross's agenda of "essential decisions" is as follows: 1. A satisfactory definition of citizenship education. Note—a satisfactory definition would, presumably, guide research, policy making, and policy implementation, and should be capable of being operationalized in practice. Such a definition requires more than a fair degree of consensus among the various actors upon whom it would impact. 2. A satisfactory distinction relative to the role of social studies curricula and the role of the school in civic education. Note—a consequential distinction would necessarily require consensus among the various actors involved in operationalizing the distinction. 3. Clarification of the role of the school in civic education. Note—this decision requires consensus of the sort

suggested for the above decisions and consensus about the general purpose of public education. 4. Identification of prime specifics on the basis of topics and issues to be emphasized, following agreement/decision on the above. 5. Identification of the best approaches to the content to be taught. Note—these last two "decisions" depend not only upon consensus surrounding all the above, but each demands its own fair share of consensus among the actors affected.

I offer these notes not because I wish to deny the importance and value of Gross's agenda, but because the consensus it demands begs important questions about another kind of agreement with which it must be compatible and to which I will turn shortly.

Gross proceeds by reminding us of what we know about evoking worthy civic attitudes, suggesting this knowledge might inform the needed "essential decisions." He also identifies further research and knowledge needs, while cautioning that the exigencies of civic education do not permit the luxury of waiting for all the research to be completed. Some of the risks of action in the absence of a knowledge base are revealed in Gross's recommendations about admissions standards, program duration, and appropriate majors for teacher candidates. While these recommendations are popular items in today's "excellence agenda," Gross—like that agenda itself—offers little logic and no evidence to demonstrate the effects of his recommendations upon civic education. This, of course, is understandable; no such evidence that I know of exists.

I have no quarrel with Gross's "essential decisions." Indeed, they apply to just about every discipline or broad field of study taught in the public school. But I had expected more from him, especially in light of his opening statement. He offers a telling observation, and the question which that observation evokes must be addressed before the agreements important to his "essential decisions" can be realized. Specifically, Gross observes that "with all the ... pontifical statements, lists of concerns, and strident recommendations, one is led to expect a near renaissance in civic education. But such has not occurred." (Emphasis added.)

I believe the expectation is a legitimate one. Why has it not been realized? I believe the answer lies in the lack of consensus surrounding what we want, generally, from the public school. I believe, further, that the nature and function of civic education is rendered extremely complex because it is more dependent upon and more bound to overall purpose than other educational/schooling matters. My view in these regards is perhaps best summed up in the following claims: We Americans do not know what we want from public schools and, hence, we do not know how to best address civic education nor how best to prepare

teachers and other school professionals to conduct beneficial civic education.

In a just-published statement on public education entitled *Pride and Promise: Schools of Excellence for All the People*, my colleagues Mary Anne Raywid and Donald R. Warren and I argue that the lack of agreement on overall school purpose accounts for many school problems ranging from fairness in judging school performance to how best to educate school professionals. We contend that the purposes of the public school tend to be unarticulated and to exist *ad hoc*, the residue of changes induced by periodic shifts in public preference. Since the early 1950s, in just three decades, public schools have been through no fewer than four different eras of criticism and reform, each pulling the school toward purposes different from, sometimes at odds with, the purposes of others.

The current wave of criticism and reform reminds us how vulnerable schools are to shifts in the dials of apparent public preference. Their vulnerability, intensified by a lack of overall purpose, makes them responsive, as dominant interests demand. More often than not the resulting changes are piecemeal and additive, rather than thoroughgoing. Add-ons to the curriculum surface here and there as part of each new reform cycle. New requirements are invoked and new options made available. New support services are developed and delivered. New school professions expand accordingly. Because each of these developments represents a constituency, little—if anything—is eliminated. The consequence is a continuing, evolving expansion of school functions and responsibilities, and a mounting confusion of purpose for schools and their critics alike.

Civic or citizenship education is inextricably bound to the overarching purpose of public eduation; more so, say, than mathematics education or computer literacy. In short, whatever its specifics, the purpose of public schooling in America is a civic one. Accordingly, the nature and function of civic education and the nature and function of the civic education of teachers are dependent upon and follow from the ultimate nature and function of public schooling. Until we have a consensus on the latter, we will not resolve the issues of the former.

Those of us directly involved in the education of school professionals are particularly "burdened" by the necessity of knowing something about the issues seeking consensus: the nature and function of schools; the context—social, political, economic—which shapes, pushes, and pulls the school in various directions; the ethos of schools and its influence on teachers and other professionals; and the nature and function of teaching and learning. These are matters, among others, that educationists study.

During the past ten to fifteen years, as education research began to match the increasing sophistication and reliability of social science research in general, and with the new research about education emerging from studies in history, philosophy, and sociology of education, we have come to know something about these matters. Policy makers, opinion makers, and those who would get involved in matters of public schooling—those who wish to merely criticize it—must consider what is known when reflecting upon civic education or education of any other kind.

Consider some elements of what is known:

- We know how vulnerable the school is to shifts in public preferences, as evidenced by the previous mention of four eras of major criticism and reform within the last three decades.
- We know that the purposes of the public school, also mentioned previously, tend to be unarticulated and *ad hoc*, the accumulation of additive changes induced by the periodic shifts in public preferences.
- We know that the lack of agreement on overall school purpose accounts for many school problems ranging, as earlier noted, from fairness in judging school performance to how best to educate school professionals.
- We know that when we qualify the word education with modifiers like civic, to get civic education—or health education, or values education, or driver education—that we risk a rush to the packaging of such education in new and additive courses and curricula, further expanding the mission of the school, fragmenting the curriculum, and perpetuating a confusion for school professionals and critics alike—a confusion of purpose.
- We know that the moral order, the ethos or climate of the school, instructs powerfully in the making of schooled citizens.
- We know that the benefits of the most ideal preparation program for school professionals are quickly washed out by what Warren calls the policy environment which situates the act of teaching, counseling, administering, or whatever. It is absurd to call for effective teachers without considering and seeking to modify that policy environment.
- We know something about the school burden, given its schizoid mission—on the one hand its charge to train, to condition, and to socialize, while on the other to educate and liberate.
- We know that the overwhelming majority of hours spent by students in preparing to become teachers is devoted to courses and curricula outside schools and departments of education. If secondary teachers are ineffective, or worse—illiterate, schools of education are not the only culprits.
- We know that educationists have extended themselves for years in

seeking to enlist their colleagues in the arts and letters in enhancing the quality of teacher preparation, only to be—time and again—rebuffed.

Schools of education cannot and in fact do not alone make good or effective school professionals. But those who would improve public and civic education must attend to what is known by educationists. With that knowledge perhaps we can cooperatively achieve the consensus demanded about the purpose of public education; only then will we be ready to tackle Gross's "essential decisions."

• • • •

Charles A. Tesconi, Jr., is a professor and dean of the College of Education and Social Services at the University of Vermont, Burlington, Vermont.

The Social Context for Essential Decisions

By Faustine C. Jones-Wilson

I find it extraordinarily disconcerting that as we examine and discuss civic education for teachers and administrators we appear to be "tiptoeing" around two central issues—or unposed questions—which are directly related to this topic. Let me pose these questions: First, if we were to define appropriately civic learning, and to find ways to accomplish that learning on the part of teachers—where do we expect these teachers thusly educated to teach? The public school as a social institution is under attack from many segments of the population, and certain segments of the people already have withdrawn from public schools in many communities. If the public school as a social institution becomes a place for only the poor and the minorities, what does this mean for our society and its commitment to democracy—with or without the civic learning we are discussing? And second, if public school teaching remains and becomes ever more a low-status, poorly-paid profession, who will choose to teach?

I concur with Richard E. Gross that it would be helpful to have a clear-cut and generally agreed upon definition of civic education. That might be a desirable outcome from our deliberations, and I urge all of us

to make formulation of such a working definition one of our primary goals. However, I do feel that we already possess a general perception of a definition of civic education, as propounded by R. Freeman Butts in his essay "The Revival of Civic Learning Requires a Prescribed Curriculum" in the winter 1982 issue of *Liberal Education*: "Preparing citizens for their role in a political community governed by manmade laws rather than by kinship, religion, or status."

On Gross's second point, I agree that the entire school—administrators and all teachers at each grade level—has responsibilities for civic education, and that the good citizen is the responsibility and product of the entire educational enterprise. That is why I advocate "civic education" for all teachers, certainly not only social studies teachers. Social studies teachers alone should not bear the brunt of "preparing citizens for their role in a political community governed by manmade laws rather than by kinship, religion, or status." I should add here that "political community" is ever more international in this rapidly changing world, although our focus here is domestic.

With regard to Gross's third point—we must look realistically at the total job of the school—I again agree. However, he has given far too little weight to the public purpose of institutionalizing public schooling. That was to shape the young to become an enlightened electorate so that democracy could be maintained, and so that effective and responsible leaders could emerge irrespective of social class—the non-propertied men, for example—or racial, ethnic, and gender origins. If, indeed, we look realistically at the total job of the school, we must begin and end with its primary reason for being—the public purpose. It is our moral responsibility to accomplish, above all, this primary goal, and no "understanding of limits" can exclude it from our definition of what the total job of the school is, and must be.

In the varied dimensions of our roles we do wrestle with parents and other adults regarding schools and school-related problems such as changing family structures and their effect on children and schools. But an unwavering dedication to our primary function means that public school teachers must be educated so that they work directly and continuously with children to attain the citizenship goals related to the public purpose of public schooling.

That is a most essential outcome of instruction. It can occur in English classes when children are made aware of the social significance of language as basic to an understanding of communication in a society. The double meanings inherent in the use of "code words," for example, are a necessary learning in today's society. Arithmetic is a social subject in the sense that is is a highly developed instrument of thought. The meaning, as well as the enjoyment, of music and art and sports may vary

from group to group, nation to nation. These school subjects can become instruments of civic education in their respective fields in the hands of well-educated teachers who understand that learnings are not ever simply "essentials," but that they must be related to the daily lives of the children/youth being taught.

When the young are taught to relate school learnings to their own lives and communities, their states and nation, the essentials come alive and have meaning for each new generation of learners. Modern heroes can, for example, replace or supplement the time-worn heroes and heroines usually employed as exemplars for the young. On television two winters ago, how many times did we see the heroic citizen jump from the Fourteenth Street Bridge outside Washington, D. C., to rescue people from the icy Potomac River following the ill-fated Air Florida crash? What kind of citizen holds other unknown citizens in such high regard that he would jeopardize his own life to save them from certain death? What values did he hold? What values did he exemplify? What was the source of those values? Why was a white male fasting—starving himself to death—in Washington, D. C., to call attention to the plight of the homeless, most of whom are black and brown? Why did he use this drastic means to influence the President of the United States to convert a temporary shelter into a model home for homeless men and women? Where are the families of these homeless persons? Why are so many of the homeless also mentally ill persons? These small examples illustrate the kind of teaching that makes concepts come alive, that sparks life into the "essentials" of instruction, and that helps to build the civic attitudes that we seek.

Gross's fifth point is the instructional challenge. How shall the school and the teacher approach the content to be taught? I'd like to address means, practical ways of providing knowledge of value to preservice teachers. A first step in this effort is to get faculty to spend time talking with undergraduates, learning to know them as people, not just as identification numbers. Since enrollments are down in many departments and schools of teacher education, faculty likely have more time to work with individuals and with smaller groups. It means putting our research aside for a day or two each week, of course. Through interaction and conversation faculty should determine what prospective teachers know about democratic values, public issues, and groups and individuals in the society who are not just like themselves. That would provide faculty with a concrete base from which to work with these undergraduates to enlarge their knowledge, increase their vision, and create new understandings.

Teacher education faculty must plan their courses so that they include varied requirements that create diverse opportunities for practical civic

learning. Undergraduate prospective teachers must attend school board meetings, school faculty meetings, PTA meetings, and the like, so that they understand every aspect of the educational enterprise. That understanding is so much more than mastering the substance of a particular content area and using different methods of reaching students. Undergraduates must visit different kinds of schools in differing neighborhoods so that they can see the diversity that exists in public school populations and plants. Visitations should be arranged to parochial schools, private schools, even prison schools that are within driving distance of the college or university. In Washington, D. C., our Howard University students also attend certain congressional committee hearings, visit community agencies, and the like. This is practical civic learning that supplements and complements standard text materials.

More emphasis needs to be placed on understanding the community. Undergraduates can learn to use census and other data to analyze the demographic characteristics of diverse census tracts in which schools exist where they might themselves eventually teach—either in their home communities or in the community where the college/university is located. An emphasis on learning about and using demographic data could be placed in social foundations of education classes required of all undergraduates who are prospective elementary or secondary school teachers.

The student teaching experience needs to be modified. If a five-year teacher education program is needed, as indicated by Gross and by some of the "excellence" reports, one modification should be a two-semester student teaching experience. One term should be spent in an average-to-high-achieving middle or upper income school, whether city or suburban, and the other term spent in a low-to-average-achieving school in an urban setting. Further, in some states it is possible to disperse students throughout the state in different kinds of communities and learning settings to increase the students' knowledge and experiences, while having some impact on the communities over time through the kinds of student teachers placed there—individuals who might return as part of the professional teaching staff after graduation. This would, of course, require a different kind of planning and supervision on the part of university faculty. My intent here focused on means—providing practical ways of imparting knowledge of value to preservice teachers—has been to say that schools or departments of education can plan to add a plethora of learning experiences that would contribute to the civic learning of teachers by enhancing their knowledge of a pluralistic, democratic society through greater participation in it.

The great problem of our day is the problem of the maintenance of a

free society where the rights of all citizens are upheld, and where all of them may be enabled to assume their responsibilities of citizenship. We have made progress in this direction, but seem to be slipping backward at this time. Unless human values are taught, including the appreciation of all human beings, we risk further slippage, for the *status quo ante* forces appear to be strongly entrenched. We must educate teachers so that they in turn educate their charges to understand that the civil rights of the humblest citizen must be protected, and—as William O. Douglas has said—that there is only one class of citizenship.

Rightfully, Gross focuses on the cognitive process since that is what schools are held accountable for by taxpayers, parents, and the society at large. That causes him to emphasize providing teachers with an understanding of the great ideas in the evolution of human freedom and justice, using social science, humanities, and science knowledge; and teaching the procedures of each discipline to undergraduates. To attain subject matter competency, he recommends that undergraduates not major in education, but that they have several early trial instructional experiences that would culminate in a fifth-year internship in cooperating local schools. This last proposition is unacceptable to me. There is not time to discuss this serious question adequately, including the different emphases in preparing elementary school teachers as contrasted with preparing teachers for secondary schools, or the variations in programs among teacher-producing institutions of higher education. In general, we can point out that many/most secondary school teacher prospects major in the content area which they expect to teach, not in education, whereas most prospective elementary teachers major in education.

The great problems of our school system are concerned with an education that is not technical, and does not involve the use of tools or technique. They involve preparing our children and youth to live in a democratic social order that will in fact include equally all of its citizens. It is not enough to give lip-service to the principles of democracy, to simply end the legal barriers that have restricted sizeable portions of the citizenry. As Edwin R. Embree said four decades ago, young people must experience democracy and practice it during the formative years of their school life in order that they may become adults committed to democracy.

In conclusion, let me quote from "Education and the Cultural Process: Introduction to Symposium" by Charles S. Johnson, who said regarding acculturation as a cultural process:

> ... When peoples of different cultures come together, there is acculturation, in which there is a constant struggle between disin-

> tegration and integration. Basically this is education. Education, thus, is more than the transmission of culture from one generation to another. It is this transmission and it is also transformation of peoples who are more or less in conflict. Under these circumstances the whole process may become painful, because it may lead to the disintegration of the culture of one or more of the groups in contact. Technical knowledge can be transmitted with relative ease. Ideas are more difficult to communicate. Implicit in the process of acculturation is solidarity of the society. In times of change, as in the present, the moral solidarity of the society itself may be undermined. One aspect of acculturation appears in the constant struggle to get a new society and a new solidarity.

The future of this country depends on our ability to educate teachers and students in democratic values. The public purposes of public education must be reaffirmed if we are to move toward that new society and new solidarity.

• • • •

Faustine C. Jones-Wilson is a professor with the Foundations of Education Department of the School of Education at Howard University, Washington, D. C.

Discussion at Fourth General Session

Discussion following the three presentations at the fourth general session focused once again on patterns of cooperation which would encourage interdisciplinary, interdepartmental, and interunit efforts at improvement in the civic learning of the teaching profession. Concerns were also raised about the quality of students seeking entry to the profession, and the need for higher salaries and more attractive working conditions in the schools.

Fifth General Session: What Should Schools of Law and Public Administration Contribute to the Civic Learning of Teachers and Administrators?

The fifth general session of the seminar was moderated by John Maguire. The focus of this session was on the question: What should schools of law and schools of public administration or public affairs contribute to the civic learning of the teaching profession?

It was assumed that seminar participants had read the formal papers prepared by C. Hugh Friedman and H. George Frederickson in response to this question, and Maguire raised a series of questions to which the speakers responded informally.

What Schools of Law Could Contribute to the Civic Learning of the Teaching Profession

By. C. Hugh Friedman

Schools of law can make important contributions to the civic learning of the teaching profession. Their faculties and students can bring several basic ingredients of substance and methodology to any effective curriculum of civic learning for teachers, both in their pre-service and in-service training. Law faculty and students can also provide a unique resource in the classroom and for related projects and activities. And, perhaps most importantly in the longer term, legal scholars can join with their colleagues in the humanities and social sciences in the attempt more explicitly to define the fundamental principles and values underlying our constitutional system that should be included in the civic learning of our youth and of all those who would teach them.

This paper will briefly discuss the importance of including law-related content and methods in the civic education of our children, and then consider what law schools could contribute to the substance and methodology—and future directions—of programs in civic learning for their teachers.

The Importance of Law-Related Education to Civic Learning.

Others have most eloquently and persuasively made the case for the inclusion of a study of the law and legal system in the civic education of our youth. Without repeating all the arguments, I shall only mention some of the more compelling ones here.

A primary reason, of course, is that an understanding of the nature of the legal order and of legal analysis and reasoning illuminates the political values of American society and clarifies the individual's role in and relation to society, thereby informing his or her sense of public responsibility.

Our society's well-being—indeed, its survival—depends upon a preponderance of persons oriented to achieving order and justice for all by the rule of law. Such a citizenry can only be realized and maintained through our youth attaining a lively understanding of what law is; why law is necessary, and its limits; what and whose law governs; the way a legal system functions; and above all, how law evolves and may be changed.

Surely such an understanding is a key link in the structuring of good citizenship. Recognizing this, the law-related education movement of the past fifteen or so years has reinvigorated civic education with programs and curricula whose substance and methods are largely adapted from law studies. Among its most laudable aims are to develop in students (1) an increased understanding of the legal and political institutions of our constitutional democracy and the fundamental values and principles upon which they were founded; (2)the intellectual skills and social attitudes necessary to function as effective and responsible citizens in a free society under a rule of law; and (3) an understanding of and willingness to use democratic processes in managing conflict and making decisions.

These goals were adopted for civic education in California's public schools by the State Board of Education in 1983 in its model graduation requirements entitled "Raising Expectations." In that extraordinary document the Board set forth as "an essential objective" of the state's intermediate and secondary schools the "enhancement of the preparation of all students to take their place in our free society as informed and participating citizens." To this end, certain courses in the social sciences aimed at developing an understanding of our legal and political systems are prescribed in considerable detail. One course is called "Individual Rights and Civic Responsibilities" and seeks to promote an appreciation for the values and principles—the "ethical considerations"—which underlie our legal-political system. Students in these courses are to explore various approaches to problem solving and decision making, and to acquire the analytical and reasoning skills to participate effectively as citizens of the United States.

I am encouraged by this development and expect other states will soon be including similar objectives for the civic learning of their youth. But the inescapable result is to exacerbate the challenges of adequately preparing teachers to be competent to satisfy such educational goals. I believe that the law schools can be a vital resource as we set about improving the civic learning of the teaching profession, particularly in those aspects relating to the substance and methodology of the legal discipline. I am disappointed that our American law schools have not played a more substantial role in the evolution of such a movement. While the contribution of a number of law professors has been significant, institutional law school efforts have been few and sporadic. In his guidebook to academic politics, *Microcosmographia Academica*, F. M. Cornford wrote over fifty years ago that "... nothing is ever done until everyone is convinced that it ought to be done, and has been convinced for so long that it is now time to do something else." It has certainly taken far too long for the law, and especially for the legal discipline, to become part of the civic education of our children and their teachers. With the impetus of current "reforms" and the opportunity they provide to revitalize civic education, one hopes that the law professoriate will become more actively engaged in the further development of what is taught and how it is taught.

What Law Schools Could Do to Improve What Is Being Taught.

1. Contributions to content: Law professors can play a vital role in developing the substance of civic education, both in the schools of education and for subsequent in-service training. The integration of law and its processes into the civic curriculum should not be left solely, or even predominately, to busy practitioners. The legal scholar can contribute in a number of ways:

a. Quality control: Legal scholars are in a position to help enhance the substantive accuracy and validity of what is taught about the law and its processes. Other disciplines, such as political science and history, may seek to describe the role played by the law, the legal system, and its institutions, as actors in the process of democratic policy-making. But in doing so, they may quite unintentionally distort the law by oversimplification of its complexities, concentrating on its public aspects or failing to elucidate essential procedural as well as substantive doctrines and their underlying policy rationale. Moreover, legal scholars can focus the teachers' attention on what is important to teach about the law from their own special frame of reference and portray the realities of the system as an antidote to common public misperceptions derived from television images and other media. To the extent law professors have experienced firsthand how the legal and political systems really

work—their strengths and limitations—they bring a unique reality base to the design of curriculum and/or the classroom. Thus, at the very least, they can provide a "quality control" for the law-related aspects of civic education.

b. Law as process: An important goal of jurisprudence is to dispel the popular image of law as a monolithic authority of fixed rules and procedures. Law professors can be effective participants in the effort to show the importance of non-legal influences—custom, public opinion, economics—on the development of the law, and how the law reflects and is affected by social concerns. They are experienced in showing the law to be more than sets of rules, policemen, and legislative programs studied in traditional civics courses. In short, law must be studied not simply as the source of authority for standards, but also as a living process by which standards are evolved and enforced. Thus viewed, the student more fully appreciates the importance of understanding the various factors and often conflicting interests which must be balanced in determining the standards, and the significance of establishing fair procedures for their consideration. The point is, a law-related education seeks primarily to raise instructive questions rather than to supply "right" answers, which, in the nature of the legal process, are subject to change tomorrow. Many laypersons, including far too many dedicated civics teachers, are preoccupied with the "right" answers, and feel that law is by nature fixed and "knowable." But lawyers and law teachers know that the law is not immutable, and that it is neither absolute nor usually certain in its applications. And they are trained, and can train others in the teaching profession, to explore fundamental issues such as justice, authority, responsibility, and freedom so as to gain an appreciation of the true nature of the legal process, and thus a healthier understanding of the society in which we live.

c. Making law studies relevant: Law professors and practitioners who monitor developments can show teachers how recent decisions can be used to update earlier "classics" and make them more "relevant"—i.e., dress the problems up in more modern-day guise so that students can more readily relate them to their own lives. After all, the law deals with a wide range of types of conflicts that are common, recurring, and relevant to today's living. And today's conflicts between individuals (private law) or between individuals and society (public law) can usually be shown to involve the same fundamental questions that have been addressed before. Moreoever, law teachers can help in the development of appropriate "hypothetical" situations to serve as the springboard for discussion and analysis of various legal issues, to enhance relevance and student engagement. The point is, teachers must themselves acquire an active understanding of the legal process as a means of

achieving bloodless resolution of certain of life's conflicts, if they are to be able to develop it in others. They, and their students, must see—and hopefully adopt—the legal process as a guide for managing controversy in their own lives. And so law must be taught so that it has practical, day-to-day implications for the life situations with which today's youth are and will be involved. Many of the subject areas taught in the law schools involve situations that are analogous to common experiences of students in their school and community environments:

Legal Subject Areas	School/Community Parallels
Contracts	Promises
Torts & criminal law	Intentional or other wrongs and injuries
Authority of public officials	Authority of principal, teacher, class officers, team captains
Constitutional issues, data banks, abortion	Privacy in home, school, person
Due process of law	Fair play in decision making, dispute resolution, etc.

Those trained in the law can help show the relevance of the method by which legal decisions are reached—of using the intellectual skills involved in legal analysis—to the minor who much decide whether to buy drugs, join a gang, or snatch a purse.

d. Legal literacy—preventative law: It is also important that civic education provide teachers and thence their students with sufficient knowledge of the present legal system to recognize when their conduct is or might be regulated by how to get assistance to avoid legal problems when they are encountered—e.g., awareness of consumer rights, responsibilities for the safety of others, etc. Teachers, and students, should also become knowledgeable about the various roles of persons functioning in the legal and political systems so as to be able to identify to whom to go for information or assistance. Here again, the familiarity of the law teacher-practitioner in these arenas can be a valuable resource for the teaching profession engaged in civic learning. Of course, the more familiar teachers and students become with these institutions and their personnel, the more comfortable and the less alienated they feel about them.

2. Contributions to methodology: Carefully conceived and thoughtful programs of law studies can give teachers and their students tools of analysis which will serve them throughout their lives. Such programs can help them to develop habits of thinking through and out their

instinctive-emotional decisions, to weigh facts and factors, consider arguments and precedents, and thus to come to reasoned conclusions. Legal education has no monopoly on disciplined thinking, but legal reasoning requires a mode of thought to which most non-lawyers are unaccustomed, yet which I believe is nevertheless essential to good citizenship. Philip Lader has referred to the legal approach to decision making as "a habit of mind" in his comprehensive piece "The Teaching of Law in the Liberal Arts Curriculum of American Colleges and Universities," and described it as follows:

> In comparative case analysis and statutory interpretation, the student is taught to develop all propositions until he can articulate their connection with reality; to test principles by their consequences and, conversely, to examine consequences in light of these principles. What is required is a habit of mind which discourages irrational responses to complex problems. Whether the college graduate is organizing materials for a corporate sales report, preparing a high school biology lecture, or participating in a national debate, this ability is crucial; and it is best cultivated by the study of legal materials.

Lader goes on to note that the student is thus trained to explore all possible alternatives, to hypothesize the consequences of these options, and "to test personal and social values in the light of the wisdom of their application in a particular case of conflicting interests." Isn't this the basic skill for effective and reponsible citizenship? Isn't the object of civic education to develop in young citizens the intellectual capacity to cope—that is, deal with and manage—with society's indeed the world's, conflicts and controversies?

a. The Socratic method: Mortimer Adler, among others, has asserted that "the primary concern in the preparation of teachers of the future should be the development of Socratic skills—the skills involved in teaching by asking, not by telling, and by leading discussions in which teachers sit around a table with their students, among equals, a better learner because of their students and thus a leader in learning." Certainly the insistent use of questions to test responses to unearth underlying operative principles, and then to test them again, develops in the participants—both teacher and student—analytical skills and other higher-level cognitive skills. Here too, while law professors have no exclusive on the Socratic method, many have been trained in it and regularly employ it, although often from a teaching podium and not always "among equals"; those who are proficient in employing it should be involved in developing similar skills in teachers.

b. Classroom and external activities: Law teachers, students, and lawyers can be important resources for developing and implementing a variety of law-related activities in the classroom and in the community. Such activities can include simulations of judicial proceedings such as mock trials and moot courts, and of alternative dispute-resolving mechanisms such as arbitrations and mediation hearings. While they should not be regarded as, or be allowed to become, the basic substance of a program, these kinds of activities—properly conducted—can enable students to apply knowledge they have gained and discern what they still do not know in a particular situation, further develop analytical skills as well as participatory skills, and foster understanding of differing points of view and feelings of political efficacy.

3. Contribution to new directions: One significant further role legal scholars can play in improving the civic learning of the teaching profession is to join with others in the social sciences and humanities to define more explicitly those fundamental principles and values underlying our constitutional system that should form the common basis for the differing approaches to civic education. The law and the humanities intersect on a whole range of fundamental principles and values—justice, freedom, equality, authority, pluralism, obligation, responsibility, due process, etc. But the time seems ripe for an attempt to formulate a defensible normative vision of American citizenship upon which a variety of programs of civic education can be based in the coming post-bicentennial decade. If such a quest were undertaken, it should involve the sustained effort of outstanding scholars and educators in the humanities, in the social sciences, and in the law, to state more explicitly the meaning of citizenship and what schools and teacher training institutions can and should be doing about fostering it in future generations. There should be no illusions about the difficulty of such a task. But the disciples of the law should be participants. While I will leave to the future a discussion of why law schools should become so involved—the costs and the benefits—I do believe there are compelling reasons for such participation. It may be true that most law schools have existed in splendid isolation from other academic departments. But today's educational reforms furnish an immense opportunity for increasing their interdisciplinary participation, and their contributions to the pursuit of civic learning.

• • • •

C. Hugh Friedman is a professor of law with the School of Law, University of San Diego, San Diego, California.

The Recovery of Civism in Public Administration

By H. George Frederickson

American government has changed significantly in the last decade. There has been a decline in confidence in most American institutions, including the government. Sharp and continuing criticisms and scapegoating of government employees is widespread, and the taxpayers are in revolt. The age of growth is replaced by the age of limits, including limitations on government. During this period there has been a significant increase in alternatives to the traditional forms of government service. Citizens are in many ways organizing to either work with governments in the delivery of services or invent collective ways of looking after their own social interests.

As a consequence, as I have described previously in the November/December 1982 issue of *Public Administration Review*, there has been a "recovery of civism in public administration." One of the keys to restoring legitimacy and authority to the government is for public officials to respond more directly to the citizens' concerns and needs. The mood, as Harlan Cleveland put it in 1972 in his *The Future Executive*, is one of wishing "to get more governance with less government." The civism perspective is one of providing systems of

governance that are less bureaucratic, less expensive, and less dominated by professional public servants; and more inclined toward partnerships with groups, sharing in the expenses or in the means of providing services.

These directions are a clear reversal of past trends. At all levels of American government we have evolved into a bureaucratic state—large, professional, expert, and impersonal. Most of us work in and are surrounded by large-scale organizations, almost all of which are built on the premise of hierarchy. There is a generally accepted orthodoxy of managerialism abroad in our organizations.

We are now witnessing, all across the land, a distinct drawing back from bureaucracy, from large-scale and expert government and from managerialism. The concept of citizenship and the notion of civism have come to be a shorthand way of summarizing this pulling back from large-scale government. Some would say the government is being returned to the people. As David Mathews has pointed out in a recent unpublished paper:

> The real problem with the bureaucratic state is that it obscures the very idea of public, so much so that the words "public" and "government" are used interchangeably. We have forgotten that the public and the government are not the same ... in the beginning ... was the public, not the government.
>
> ... All governments are public (or have their origins in publics), but all publics are not governments. The public is pregovernmental, even prepolitical; it is the environment out of which governments grow. Civic organizations and voluntary associations, the church's softball league and the college students' voter registration drive, the town meeting and the fund drive for a day-care center—all of these are expressions of our public life ...
>
> What we participate in first, when we exercise our sovereignty most directly, is in shaping our public life. Participation in the nation's life, then, does not mean merely responding to the government.

At about the beginning of the twentieth century, the time of the modern origins of public administration, the notion of public as distinct from government was understood. The role and place of the individual citizen was considered to be a part of the common subject matter of those who presumed to be preparing for the public service. Indeed, the early schools were ordinarily called schools of citizenship and public

affairs or public administration. The first dean of the oldest and best known of such schools, the Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs, William E. Mosier, edited an early book with his faculty colleagues entitled *Responsible Citizenship*.

In Paul P. Van Riper's brilliant analysis "The American Administrative State: Wilson and the Founders—An Unorthodox View," which appears in the November/December 1983 issue of *Public Administration Review*, he reminds us that the origins of modern public administration trace most particularly to Hamilton, Madison, and the Federalists. The founding fathers were products of the Enlightenment, and therefore "rational" in their perspective, concerned with law and equality, interested in systematic procedures and records, concerned about the quality and quantity of available data, and interested in concepts such as accountability and responsibility. All of this they felt was an important part of making democracy workable and responsive.

It was not, however, until Woodrow Wilson that we find a large body of systematic literature describing more fully an administrative perspective on American government. In "The Study of Administration" in 1887, Wilson noted that in a democracy it is not the monarch that is sovereign, but the people. Public administrators, according to Wilson, should have a direct link to the sovereign, the people, to be influenced by their opinions, and to be responsive to them. The public administrators were to be full partners with the legislature, the courts, the executives, and the people in the search for good government.

Many of these themes were common in the study and practice of public administration until the mid-1930s. It was at that time that "the administrative state" and preoccupations with managerialism and the application of business methods to public service became the principal concerns of those teaching and practicing public administration. Citizenship as a concept in education for public service, and as a factor to be considered by public administrators in their practice, disappeared from the scene.

But now, in the mid-1980s, the recovery of civism includes, as Louis C. Gawthorp indicates in the March 1984 issue of *Public Administration Review*:

> ... the primary responsibility of the permanent career civil service, at all levels of government, [is] to insure the vitality of citizenship in an active citizenry fully engaged in the art of government—in short, it must insure a dynamic revitalization of the concepts of civis (citizen), civitas (citizenship), and civilitas (the art of government).

> ... This necessitates a basic redefinition of public administration as a profession, and as such it represents a bold departure from the past. Is it the proper function of the government to elevate the quality of civitas in our society? Is it the proper function of public administration to enhance the character of civilitas in our polity?

In his reconsideration of the notion of citizenship as it relates to public administration in that same issue of *Public Administration Review*, David K. Hart calls for the renewal of "virtue" among citizens coupled with the development of "honorable" bureaucrats. Citizenship, he points out, assumes rights and obligations clearly understood by the people, the public. Virtue, Hart asserts, is the voluntary conformity to the moral laws or standards of right conduct in a society. The ultimate measure of a state was the level of virtue achieved by its citizens. Government was not to impose this virtue, but it was to come from the voluntary efforts of a free people. Hart states:

> The Founders understood that the key to successful democracy lay more in the quality of the citizens than in the quality of their leaders. This may seem idealistic in our leader-obsessed age, but even the pessimistic Madison agreed:
>
> > That I go on this great Republican principle that the people will have virtue and intelligence to select men of virtue and wisdom. Is there no virtue among us? If there is not, we are in a wretched situation. No theoretical checks, no form of government can render us secure. To suppose any form of government will secure liberty or happiness without any virtue in the people is a chimerical idea. If there be sufficient virtue and intelligence in the community, it will be exercised in the selection of those men so that we do not depend on their virtue, or put confidence in our rulers, but in the people who are to choose them.
>
> To conclude, in the just society envisioned by the Founders, individual virtue and good citizenship were inseparable ... To use the old fashioned, but more appropriate term, we must seek virtue in our citizens and honor in our bureaucrats. Virtuous citizens require honorable bureaucrats, and bureaucrats cannot find honor without virtuous citizens.

Hart reminds us that "the professional obligation of public adminis-

trators begins with their duties as virtuous citizens." That status is their essential link to the constituency they will serve throughout their careers. When one accepts the calling of public administrator, one also accepts the responsibility of transcending that ordinary virtue to seek honor. If Hart's analysis is correct, the contemporary citizenship movement bodes well for public administration. With a more active and informed citizenry, sharing in the provision of government services, the prospects for greater understanding of and support for public servants increase.

Eugene McGregor has assessed the effects of democratic citizenship on the practices of public personnel adminstration. He points out that we are nearing a fully merged public and private economy in which the distinction between that which is government and that which is not is blurry at best. Public servants in this context must enhance citizenship, or in other words help the people be "public." In the modern world of public service McGregor suggests in the same issue of *Public Administration Review* as above that there are three goals associated with citizenship and the career public service. First, the citizens and their representatives must support and defend the public service. Second, there must be the development of "civic capital formation," whereby citizens become better-informed participants in the policy process. Third, he states:

> ... broaden the meaning of public service. Thus we speak of public service reform rather than "civil service reform," since the latter idea refers to discrete changes in governmental employment systems and the former notion refers to the larger service institutions of which civil service is merely a small part. Regardless of how civil service reform works out, the larger point looms: a merger of public and private sectors means the boundaries of public service will cease to be coterminous with government employment. Harlan Cleveland is precisely correct that as President of the Chrysler Corporation, Lee Iacocca is really a civil servant under the Chrysler Corporation Loan Guarantee Act of 1979: his effective Board of Directors is the Secretary of the Treasury, Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, and the Comptroller General of the United States. In such situations, there is no choice but to redefine and expand the scope of public service. Civic conversation must at least keep abreast of operational reality.

It is clear that career public servants are expert and are influential in government affairs. What, then, are their responsibilities with respect

to a less informed and less expert citizenry? John Rohr, in yet another essay in the March 1984 issue of *Public Administration Review*, suggests:

> I would urge the career civil servant to come to terms with his or her role as part of a governing elite; but instead of indulging the arrogance associated with elitism, let the career civil servant work at broadening the base of the elite by encouraging as many members of the public as possible to become citizens in the classical mold—that is to change from citizen as consumer to citizen participating in rule. The means for doing this is public instruction, not in the bookish sense of the schools, but in the daily interaction between the citizen and the bureaucracy.

It would be erroneous to assume that this is primarily a theoretical discussion. In fact an enhanced and growing citizenship is everywhere apparent. The International City Management Association did a study entitled "Alternative Approaches for Delivering Public Service" in which they analyzed 1,780 local governments and their various modes of public service. Four different methods of "coproduction" or "coprovision" where found to be common in the delivery of such public services. Coproduction is here taken to mean the merged production of a public service by a combination of public and private organizations. Coprovision has essentially the same meaning, although it implies a rather stronger volunteer and self-help flavor. The four primary means of coproduction and coprovision identified in the study are the use of volunteers, the use of citizen self-help, the organization of neighborhood groups, and the use of nonprofit organizations. Volunteers are used to provide free help to local governments in the delivery of public services. Self-help is defined as an effort in which individuals or groups undertake an activity resulting in reducing the government activity required, and where the individuals involved benefit directly. In addition to volunteerism and self-help, one finds the common use of government contracting out to nonprofit organizations and neighborhood groups for the provision of services.

The use of these four methods of rather direct citizen involvement in government services was found to be particularly common in the crime and fire prevention activities of local government, especially with respect to the use of nonprofit organizations for the provision of emergency medical services and ambulances. Nonprofit neighborhood organizations have also found widespread use in the health and human services fields, including mental health, drug and alchohol treatment, hospitals, programs and housing for the elderly, child welfare and

day-care facilities, and animal shelters.

Volunteerism was found to be very common in crime and fire prevention, emergency medical services, and the provision of ambulance services. Volunteers and self-help programs were also common in such areas as child welfare, programs for the elderly, public health, drug and alcohol treatment, and mental health. In recreational services one also finds the widespread use of all four forms of citizen involvement through coprovision; a similar situation exists with respect to support for libraries, museums, and cultural arts programs.

In a recent review of coproduction prepared by Charles H. Levine for the International City Management Association he points out that governments have chosen a number of avenues to lighten their financial load. Many of these involve citizens more directly in governmental affairs and have profound implications for public service. Levine's list includes:

> A. Privatizing service delivery: 1. Contracting with a private for-profit firm; 2. Franchising services to a private firm; 3. Vouchers; 4. User fees and charges to ration demand for services; 5. Sheading service responsibility to a private firm or nonprofit organization.
>
> B. Intergovernmentalizing service delivery arrangements: 1. Sheading services to another unit of government authority; 2. Sharing service responsibility; 3. Sharing functions like data processing, planning, and communications.
>
> C. Improving operating productivity: 1. Methods to monitor performance; 2. Methods to maximize output per dollar; 3. Methods to improve financial decision making; 4. Methods to track costs; 5. Methods to monitor and manage contracts.
>
> D. Deprofessionalizing bureaucracies: 1. Civilianizing sworn personnel; 2. Using volunteers and paraprofessionals; 3. Using reserves and auxiliaries.
>
> E. Devolving service responsibility: 1. Neighborhood organization of service delivery; 2. Self-help; 3. Coproduction; 4. Public/private partnerships to solve community problems.

In one form or another all of these systems of nonbureaucratic and nonmanagerial action include more direct citizen involvement in government. In assessing the implications of this for the development

of an improved citizenry, Levine concludes:

> Those who believe that citizenship, civic virtue, and "public service" should be an important part of our national culture should be distressed that these features of democracy have come to be regarded as a mere myth in a polity that increasingly rewards narrow self-interest. Even those who accept this condition as a natural outgrowth of the characteristics of modern life should be disturbed by our failure to reconcile the growing gap between the role of citizens and public employees.
>
> For those who wish a more communitarian arrangement of their civic life, coproduction promises a beginning that can be built upon, once working with public employees and with neighborhoods becomes habitual and an integral part of life. Once this occurs, the prospects for a revitalization of a communitarian spirit rise as they experience the satisfaction of generally solving problems.
>
> For the public administrator the lessons are clear: the strategy for coproduction promises to be a powerful tool for resolving fiscal stress and an auspicious start on the road to restoring the trust and support of citizens for their public institutions.

The implications of the civism movement for public administration are profound. Government is changing, particularly at the local level, with less reliance on paid public employees, especially in areas that do not require high levels of technical expertise, and with an increased use of alternative forms of "public" but not governmental provision of services. The assessment of most theorists to date is that this movement will have an enhancing effect on the legitimacy of government and on the effectiveness of the professional public service, and will also require an adaptable public service willing to mediate between the interests of the citizens, elected legislators and executives, and the courts.

There was a time when it was assumed that the principal means by which persons exercised their democratic responsibilities was to vote. Now it is increasingly clear that one's democratic responsibilities include a notion of citizenship that could involve any one of many forms of direct public activity, particularly as the lines between the public and private sectors blur. Will this mean more effective government? And if it does, will it mean more effective government for <u>all</u> the citizens? If not, which citizens will be advantaged and which disadvantaged by the

new civism?

These questions, their potential answers, the overall impact of the new civism, and the maximization of its benefits for all are issues and concerns of obvious importance and immediacy to the civic learning of American teachers. The new civism must be a significant part of the civic learning curriculum for teachers and for their students in the nation's schools.

• • • •

H. George Frederickson is president of Eastern Washington University, Cheney, Washington.

Discussion at Fifth General Session

Following the dialogue between the two speakers at the fifth general session, discussion focused on the general disconnectedness of contemporary American society and the reflections of this phenomenon in our educational institutions. As in discussion following previous sessions of the seminar, a variety of ideas were offered concerning ways of encouraging interdisciplinary educational efforts which would break down such patterns of academic isolation.

Reception and Dinner: Presentation and Discussion

Following a reception and dinner for all seminar participants at the Stanford University Faculty Club, a brief program moderated by Gerald A. Dorfman featured presentations by J. Myron Atkin and Donald Kennedy.

All seminar participants were then divided into seven discussion groups, each charged with developing recommendations for improving the civic learning of the teaching profession.

The Centrality of Public Education

By J. Myron Atkin

Much of the focus in education reform today is on educating people for the world of work and on improving our programs in schools so that youngsters are better prepared for college. There is considerable emphasis on science and mathematics, on developing skills in writing and computation, and on learning about computers. All of this is certainly very important, but too many people are missing what I believe to be one of the core issues underlying American concern about the schools today: building a sense of community, both in a local and a national sense.

A sense of community and nationhood is what holds us together as a people, of course. However, we feel threatened and vulnerable as a result of the fragmentation in our society that has seemed more visible in recent decades. This unease is reflected in the confidence we feel, or do not feel, in our public institutions, of which the schools are a prominent part.

Notice that much of the talk about reforming schools centers on public education. It could be otherwise; we could be talking about schemes that emphasize the importance of the private sector in educa-

tion. It is noteworthy that, as far as I know, there is really only one eminent politician who presses for voucher plans and tuition tax credits. While he happens to be President of the United States, his theme is not being taken up at the local level by state governors or legislators.

I think most politicians sense that an important part of the future of this country lies in public education if we are to be an integrated society. There may well be a cultural memory in the body politic that recognizes the role of public schools, the common schools, in forging a sense of common purpose. We recognize that there are very few institutions that emphasize what it is we as a people share in our history and in our values. The public school is one of them.

Therefore, I underscore the importance of a conference on a theme like civic learning for teachers. What does this theme mean? What can we do in the education of teachers to emphasize community? I think we have a chance to strike a fundamental chord in the American consciousness. I don't know how long we will have such an opportunity. Perhaps there is a fifty-fifty possibility that we will see our public school system fragment to a significant degree. I am not yet alarmed about the figures regarding the percentage of youngsters who are not participating in public education. But I think that the system is more vulnerable than we realize.

I wish you well in this conference. I hope to see publications and other results that address the theme of civic learning in a way that begins to capture the public imagination as much as science and mathematics teaching, as much as education for employment. Civic education and its relationship to community and nationhood is a theme that must be supported if the centrality of the public schools is to be maintained.

• • • •

J. Myron Atkin is dean of the School of Education at Stanford University, Stanford, California.

Intersecting Themes

By Donald Kennedy

I want to stress a couple of reasons why there are two intersecting themes in this seminar, why it is important to connect them, and why I am glad we have an opportunity to try. The themes, of course, are civic learning on the one hand—what we are going to do in this country about the problem of public service and the understanding of public obligation—and teacher education on the other—what we are going to do about preparing young people to do the terribly important work of teaching and learning in the schools.

I think both of these ventures are in conspicuous trouble, and I decided about three years ago that no university president ought to allow the students on his or her campus to escape without knowing that he or she believes they are in some trouble. So I started complaining—and that wasn't particularly satisfying. Then I started a couple of modest initiatives on the Stanford campus, at which point Myron Atkin gave me the opportunity to participate in yet another. I want to share with you a bit about these ventures and why I believe they have come together significantly.

The first thing I concluded about our problem was that the erosion of

public faith in public service and in government generally and the difficulties that the schools were experiencing were not separate or independent phenomena. Rather, they are coupled through the fact that for centuries in this country the primary public presence, the primary government presence in the lives of people, has been either the school teacher or the postmaster, and—most prominently—the former. As respect for public duty wanes among young people, teaching is going to do worse and as a result public education will suffer. As faith in the discharge of public obligation and in the function of government rises, teachers and education in general will do better.

Having decided that these problems are coupled, I thought that probably some solutions should be coupled in a similar manner. And so, two things happened. First, Atkin wandered into my office with a good idea, saying—rather hesitantly at first—that he had a notion about a Stanford project with the public schools in this area, and asking if I would like to play a role in it. My response: "Terrific."

We are now the co-directors of a study that involves Stanford with half a dozen school districts. Seven different study groups are working on particular issues, such as: What is the real curriculum after the door to the classroom has closed? What are all the things society is asking the schools to do, and how can they deliver on all of them? What is the role of the new technology, and computers especially, in education? And how can we do a better job of educating for international obligations and understandings than we are now doing? This is a quick sampling of the issues that our study groups are examining.

We have gone out and raised quite a lot of money for the project, and we have many faculty involved in the effort. We have very functional, very warm, and very exciting relationships with these school districts. I think something truly extraordinary is going to emerge from all of this. But of all of the goals of the study, among which is getting out a report about what schools can do that rests upon a new data base and reaches some conclusions about how one can implement important and useful changes in the schools, nothing in my judgment is more important than using the project as a device and an opportunity to attract the interests of members of Stanford's faculty from outside the School of Education to educational problems and issues of school policy.

Stanford is, believe me, not exceptional among major research universities in this country. It would probably be possible for us to fill this room with people from outside our medical school who proclaim that they have a serious academic interest in health policy in this country. On the other hand, the number of faculty from outside the School of Education that we could assemble who would make the equivalent statement about educational policy would probably, at the beginning of

our school study venture, have filled less than a fraction of the room.

Yet, I think it is arguable that these two policy areas—education and health—are approximately of equal importance to our society, and I think it follows that a responsible institution of higher education ought to try to get some kind of parity in terms of the intensity of serious academic focus on such issues outside of the professional schools in question. So this was an important objective for us. In the meantime, of course, we, like you, have turned out to be remarkably prescient because everyone is publishing reports that are full of concern about education. However, they have not to date contributed much to the data base, and have not developed many new models with which to work. Thus, we think we have an excellent chance to fill a really serious void.

The second thing I've been trying to do is to talk to students at Stanford about their obligations to the society of which they are a part. Such conversation relates not merely to teaching, although that is clearly one major point on a spectrum of public service possibilities we offer. We urge in addition that they volunteer while they are students to get concerned about government and its quality and processes, to become involved during the summers in public and independent sector activities, and to seriously consider careers in such areas.

These efforts have been abroad for about two years now, first as simply a matter of talk, and more recently as an initiative with a very active, effective, and persuasive person behind it. And I can tell you that a number of surprising things have happened. We tripled our rate of Peace Corps volunteering in a year. We have students competing actively for summer fellowships of a very modest financial quality to go and do exciting things. We are about to announce a postgraduate fellowship program for outstanding undergraduates which will place them in internships in public and independent sector positions.

In short, we have a whole array of new programs that we hope will raise both the visibility and the incentives for students to move into service careers, and we never lose the opportunity to try and affiliate these two themes. I think that civic learning—coming to a greater understanding about the relations between citizen and state—and the educational system are deeply interconnected. It is because the educational system itself is one of the state's highest purposes. It is, after all, society's greatest laboratory of shared responsibility.

The school is the place in which the individual first confronts the state. It represents the state's most fundamental effort at discharging its collective responsibility. For the young student, school is the first encounter, indeed often the first collision between the private person and the public purpose. "What am I doing in school?" kids ask themselves. It sounds like a dumb question, but as Mark Twain once said of

the music of Wagner, "It is not as bad as it sounds." In fact, it's a deep question, and bright youngsters have long pondered it without much success.

No sophisticated person these days ever admits to having seen the movie *E.T.*, but I did—and I liked it, and I'm happy to confess so publicly. My favorite line in that film occurs when the extraterrestrial creature has not only been discovered by the little boy who becomes its best friend, but also the secret and the custody and care of the creature has been shared with the skeptical older brother, who up until this point was more interested in football and stuff like that. In the scene that I liked best the two brothers are headed off to school on their bicycles. The younger one, who has known about all these wonders for much longer, gets on his bicycle. The older one, carrying his football gear, gets on his much larger bicycle, and says to his little brother, "Did you tell him about school?" The younger brother turns to his older sibling and says, "How do you explain school to a higher intelligence?"

What am I doing in school, indeed? Answer: I am here because of something called the social contract—because a set of very old and deep-lined cultural arrangements connect me as an individual to something called obligation. It is a remarkable thing that the childless pay taxes to support the education of other people's children, and even more remarkable that nobody argues about it anymore because our culture really believes so deeply in the diffusely distributed benefits of the improvement of this society through an educated citizenry. I think that is the particular lesson of being in school, the answer to the youngster's question. The school represents the young person's first contact with the paradigm of social responsibility.

Yet, it is absolutely astonishing to me how little we really regard that as a fundamental task of education, and how little effort we make to get participants in the educational process to consider what is represented by such an extraordinary ensemble of public commitment. I take it that is really what this seminar is all about, and I merely argue that it is a question of significance, and a good place to start in your deliberations.

It is a good place to start with respect to considering the real meaning of schools. What do they say about the relationship between citizen and state? What do they suggest about the commitment of teachers, and about the role of teachers and of parents? What do they say about the nature of bureaucracy? What is wrong with it and what about it might be made better? What do they say, in short, about the values that we associate, or fail to associate, with public service? I think all those lessons can begin to be taught in the schools by the prepared person.

One of the things I find most surprising, as president of a university, is that in this particular time and this particular place there is less faith

on the part of the best and the brightest young men and women in their capacity to contribute usefully and productively to the public sector. That is the reason for my concern, that is what your efforts here in this seminar are all about, and—in a different way—that is what I believe Stanford and our school study is all about. I hope that, as a result of your efforts and ours, we will find a day in the not too distant future in which we are authentically ashamed if our educational institutions turn out students who have not seriously considered the basis of their obligation to their fellow citizens. I think we should be concerned and disappointed if a significant proportion of them have not made commitments to that obligation. I submit that as a reasonable goal for the civic learning about which you are talking and seeking to improve. I want you to know that I believe your venture is a noble one, and one in which I hope we all succeed; if we flag in these efforts, I hope we will be quick to get after one another.

• • • •

Donald Kennedy is president of Stanford University, Stanford, California.

Closing General Session: Reports and Recommendations

At the closing general session of the seminar each of the seven discussion group leaders presented a report on group deliberations and recommendations.

Upon the close of the seminar a working committee was constituted to coordinate the development of reports and publications of the seminar and to consider steps necessary to implement recommendations of the seminar. A composite report on the recommendations of the seminar has been prepared by Alan H. Jones as part of this effort.

A general bibliography containing published materials distributed at the seminar and references cited in the seventeen papers presented at the seminar has also been developed.

Report of Discussion Group Number One

Discussion group number one offers the following three proposals:

1. We propose that pilot coalitions be established, at selected colleges and universities around the country, of faculty from the humanities, social sciences, sciences, schools of education, schools of law, and other schools such as business, if they wish to join, to focus on the preparation of teachers for civic education. Schools of education should coordinate such endeavors. Each coalition should take as its first task the identification of common elements that members agree are contained in civic education in a democracy. Each coalition should then design and implement its own program to prepare teachers to teach these elements in the public schools. The pilot coalitions should be evaluated with respect to their effectiveness after three to five years.

2. Since there is no inventory of what is and has been effective in the area of civic education, we propose that a research project be established to: A) Summarize the literature on effective civic education. We need historical perspective on how it has been assessed, what variables have been studied, and what outcomes have been observed. B) Prepare case studies of schools where effective civic education seems to be taking

place, in order to provide profiles of students, teachers, curricula, school environments, and school neighborhoods or enrollment areas. We suggest such research questions as: Who is doing the teaching and to whom? In which grades and which subjects is civic education being taught? What extra-curricular activities provide civic education? Are any key social agencies working with the school on civic education?

3. We propose the establishment of some pilot teacher education programs to model in their structure and content the following two aspects of civic education: A) Action learning—through participation, service to the community as defined by the participants, and/or simulations; and B) Cooperative learning—through group problem solving. We suggest that such programs use the research of Robert Slavin, the Johnson brothers, and Stanley Aronson, among others, for the design of their activities. We realize that cooperative learning may be dealt with in a variety of ways, and we suggest that cooperation with other areas than education could yield fruitful new ideas, as for instance, the materials of the California State Bar Program—a multi-media package entitled *Law in a Free Society, K-12.*

There is no reason why the three proposals above should be conducted separately. It might be, for instance, that the pilot coalitions would choose to introduce cooperative learning into their projects. However, we recommend that separate evaluations be made of the effectiveness of cooperative learning and action learning as the foci of teacher education programs.

• • • •

The members of discussion group number one were: Joe R. Burnett, Joan Burstyn (group leader and reporter), C. Hugh Friedman, Richard E. Gross, Paul L. Murphy, and Mary Anne Raywid.

Report of Discussion Group Number Two

Discussion group number two presents the following six ideas:

1. With respect to a definition of civic education: A) It would be premature and devisive to attempt at this time to develop a restricting definition of civic education. B) In the interim, it would be valuable to develop some flexible and tentative perimeters around the concept of civic education, in order to provide broad inclusiveness while at the same time not allowing the idea to be expanded to the point of meaninglessness.

2. With respect to the content of K-12 civic education: A) Examination of values and assumptions, including basic American values such as democracy, justice, and diversity without divisiveness, and students' personal assumptions about their nation and their role in it. B) Sources for addressing civic education, including school materials such as basic United States documents ranging from the Declaration of Independence to Martin Luther King's letter from a Birmingham jail, and non-school materials such as local community resources and mass media. C) Processes for civic education, including personal interaction and the addressing of controversial issues.

3. With respect to contextual issues to be considered: A) Adequate financial resources for effective teaching. B) Attention to the increasing ethnic diversity of American society. C) Educational conditions, including school conditions that promote or constrain positive teaching, and school and district climates that must be improved in order to permit the discussion of controversial issues.

4. With respect to civic learning goals for teacher education: A) For teachers to be successful civic educators, they must be convinced of the significance of their teaching and the importance of the role they play in society, and they must have a grasp of such basic factors as their own assumptions and beliefs about the value and purpose of education, their own socialization, and the school and non-school socializing forces that are at work. B) Teacher trainees must be engaged in the serious consideration of those and other civic learning issues.

5. With respect to implementation of civic education: A) Where should civic education occur in the curriculum? Social studies should naturally provide the cutting edge. Other subject areas should provide support for civic education through the formal and informal curriculum. Just because some civic education "stuff" is presented in a classroom, this does not make it good civic education unless it is part of a thoughtful design. B) Civic education should be a cooperative enterprise between schools of education and the liberal arts, K-12 teachers and students, school and district administrators, and the community.

6. Recommended future actions: A) Galvanize support by university presidents for civic education. B) Discuss civic education at national meetings, such as the Council of Chief State School Officers and the Council of Great City Schools. C) Engage school administrators, school boards, business people, union leaders, ethnic community leaders, and other members of the community in discussions of civic education. D) Promote continued discussions of civic education, possibly through a national task force chaired by R. Freeman Butts.

• • • •

The members of discussion group number two were: James M. Banner, Jr., R. Freeman Butts, Carlos E. Cortes (group leader and reporter), Bernard Gifford, Jack Hoar, and James P. Shaver.

Report of Discussion Group Number Three

Discussion group number three offers the following eleven recommendations:

1. Establish a national service corps.

2. Establish sabbatical leaves for teachers through which they can expand their networks, and tie such leaves to an institutional purpose within the public schools.

3. Establish seminars, on the style of those of the national Endowment for the Humanities, devoted to an examination of the American educational system.

4. Establish internship experiences in cultures other than their own for teachers and for students in teacher education.

5. Establish an American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education task force on civic education.

6. Establish a national teleconference to share information on civic education programs.

7. Study those schools where the predictable correlations between racial, ethnic, and social background and school achievement do not occur.

8. Place ethnographers in schools.

9. Encourage arts and science and education faculty to examine curriculum matters together.

10. Encourage professional schools to examine curriculum matters dealing with civic education cooperatively, perhaps through joint faculty seminars.

11. Encourage objective, critical study of television, and make this part of the curriculum of civic education.

• • • •

The members of discussion group number three were: Ayers Bagley, Mervyn Cadwallader, Joseph de Vitis, Wayne Dumas, Diane U. Eisenberg, Barbara Finkelstein, Sherry Magill (co-group leader and reporter), Robert L. Saunders (co-group leader and reporter), Manfred Stanley, Charles A. Tesconi, Jr., and Donald R. Warren.

Report of Discussion Group Number Four

There was a consensus among the group that the topic of civic education is timely and of great importance, focusing, as it does, on an area of education in which there is a need for significant improvement. The group felt that the work of the seminar should not end with its adjournment, but rather that it should serve as a means of launching a national effort to reform and revitalize civic education in our nation's schools. However, the planning of the specific steps to take to launch a national effort designed to take advantage of the work of the seminar and to build upon it is both difficult and demanding, and will require extensive discussion.

In light of the above, discussion group number four has two major recommendations to make:

1. An *ad hoc* committee should be formed to correspond and meet periodically to draft a plan of action for the reform and revitalization of the civic learning of teachers.

2. Faculty from the diverse disciplines represented at the seminar should be encouraged to begin immediately to work together with others at their institutions to develop and evaluate a number of alterna-

tive model programs to improve the civic learning of teachers.

With respect to the *ad hoc* committee suggested in the first of the two recommendations, discussion group four believes that such a committee should be composed of representatives from the fields of education, the humanities, the social sciences, the law, and other relevant disciplines of institutions of higher learning, and of persons serving at administrative and supervisorial positions at the precollegiate level. While discussion group number four does not suggest specific tasks for the proposed committee, the following items should be placed on its agenda for consideration:

Policy statement—A policy statement might be drafted which would outline the responsibility of institutions of higher education to provide effective civic education for prospective teachers. Once drafted, this could be widely distributed and used as a means of fostering reform.

Model curriculum—A model curriculum for the civic education of prospective teachers might be developed and used as the basis for experimental programs in teacher training institutions.

Credential requirements—Model legislation providing for effective civic education of prospective teachers might be developed with the cooperation of the National Council for Teacher Credential Standards.

Research on past and present practices—Research should be conducted to determine what is being done in the civic education of teachers and their students. This might include attention to such factors as legislative mandates, identification of exemplary programs, the need for improvement, educational materials, etc.

Development of position papers—A number of papers might be developed that would be useful in the reform of civic education. Some of these might be done with a relatively low level of resources whereas others might require considerable time and expense to produce. The following ideas were discussed:

- Mandate for change: A paper should be developed which sets forth a mandate for the reform of the civic education of teachers. This might be similar to the recent reports of national commissions calling for the improvement of different areas of education such as the report of the National Commission on Excellence in Education or the "Boyer" report.

- Goals and objectives statement: A paper should be developed which addresses such questions as: What is civic education: What are the characteristics of a competent and responsible citizen? How might these characteristics best be fostered by educational programs?

- Identification and explication of principles and values: A major stumbling block to reform may well be the fact that there is no work which has comprehensively identified and explicated the fundamental principles and values of our constitutional democracy in a form suitable for guiding the development of educational programs. This is seen as a major task requiring a cooperative effort of scholars, practitioners, and representatives of key community groups and organizations. It may well be worth giving this task a high priority, particularly in light of the need for reform and the opportunities that may be generated by the events of the bicentennials of the Constitution and Bill of Rights.

Organizing for change—In developing its action plan, the committee should consider the desirability of either creating a new national organization devoted to the goals of this endeavor and/or of linking the efforts it suggests with existing national organizations whose mandates are related to the goals, e.g., Council for the Advancement of Citizenship, National Council for the Social Studies, Center for Civic Education, Association of American Colleges, etc. What organization, if any, is formed should include representation of the diverse fields that participated in the seminar as well as from key elements of the private sector such as bar associations, business and industry, philanthropical organizations, and representatives of local, state, and the federal governments.

To conclude, the topic of the seminar is of such great importance that discussion group number four felt that concerted efforts should be undertaken to build upon the experience, to continue the dialogue, and, most important, for all concerned to organize in a well-focused effort to bring about the reform and revitalization of the civic education of teachers and their students.

• • • •

The members of discussion group number four were: Mark Curtis, Thomas Dynesson, Christopher J. Lucas, Larry T. McGehee, Charles N. Quigley (group leader and reporter), and John Anthony Scott.

Report of Discussion Group Number Five

Discussion group number five offers the following six suggestions:

1. It is important that some program or strategy be developed that will allow the participants from the seminar, or others who are similarly motivated, to speak on a continuing basis to the importance of civic and citizenship education as an essential component of the education of people in a free society. We believe that a social climate now prevails that presents us with a rare opportunity to secure a higher priority for citizenship education than has hitherto been the case. At no time since World War II have conditions been better for the promotion of citizenship education than they are now, and this opportunity should not be wasted. We believe that the efforts begun at the seminar must be sustained. This could take the form of a working committee that would assemble recommendations, follow through in implementation of such recommendations, maintain the network of individuals and institutions represented in the seminar, share information, and reconvene the seminar if necessary. The seminar should not be both the beginning and the end for the call for improved civic and citizenship education.

2. We believe that the seminar has underscored the need for massive

research efforts in civic education. For example: A) We need to be more knowledgeable about existing practices in schools; we need to know more precisely what is going on "out there." B) We need to know more about which teacher education strategies seem to be most productive in helping prospective teachers build effective instructional programs in civic education. C) We need to know more about the restraints of the workplace and the socializing forces that operate in the culture of the school that inhibit creative teaching. D) We need to know the relative merits of experiences in teacher education that call for direct involvement and social action as compared with didactic presentation modes. E) We need to know more about citizenship education efforts that were tried earlier in this century and have since been abandoned. Why were they terminated? What happened to those programs? F) We need to know more about state legislative requirements that affect curricula in civic education as well as regulations that govern certification requirements for teachers. G) We need to make a convincing case for the need of funding agencies to invest money in research and development in the field of civic and citizenship education.

3. We believe that a major action item, at some appropriate time down the road, is to enter into a dialogue with accrediting agencies, such as the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education and the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification, to build into their standards requirements that address the civic education of prospective teachers. This is presently covered in a general way by the behavioral and humanistic studies standard, but we believe the requirement should be more explicit in addressing civic education. Program revisions are likely to be short-lived unless they are institutionalized in the existing systems of the establishment.

4. We discussed the idea of a "National Commission for Civic Education" and concluded that it would be premature to call for the formation of such a group.

5. We need to continue to enlist the support of prestigious leaders in and outside of the educational enterprise—persons such as those in attendance at the seminar and counterparts at other institutions. Such influence shapers are enormously important in promoting civic education.

6. We discussed at length whether or not there was a need to define more precisely the terms we are using in our conversations, as, for example, "civic education" and "citizenship education." Some of us believe that such definitions are needed in order to facilitate communication; other felt it better to leave the terms undefined at this time.

• • • •

The members of discussion group number five were: Tom James, John Jarolimek (group leader and reporter), Faustine C. Jones-Wilson, and Peter A. Sola.

Report of Discussion Group Number Six

The conversation of discussion group number six revealed clear agreement on the dire nature of the problems with which the seminar was wrestling, as well as on the need for initiatives to counter such societal directions. Although the recommendations being made by the group as a result of such discussion are in most respects similar to those proposed by other of the discussion groups, it may well be that we have arrived at such recommendations in different ways. For that reason we shall first explain the concerns which marked our discussion.

Our considerations were grounded particularly in some of the observations which had been made during earlier portions of the seminar—most notably John Maguire's references to the profoundly disconnected nature of American society in the 1980s, Faustine C. Jones-Wilson's warnings about the potential transformation of our public schools into institutions serving only the poor and minorities, and the pall which hangs over all of humankind because we possess the ability of nuclear self-destruction.

In the context of such unpleasant realities and possibilities, we were unanimous in our feeling that the issue of civic learning for teachers and

administrators must be approached as part of a larger societal effort to establish and enhance connections which would help counter the destructive and disintegrative forces which concern us. We do not believe that the solution lies in such simplistic notions as additional course requirements, new state or federal laws or regulations, or the creation of a new national endowment. We feel this way for two reasons. First, we believe that the problem is larger than such specifics, and that a more pervasive effort is needed to expand our discussion and permeate our institutions. Second, we are deeply concerned that in our nation's current political climate, such traditional initiatives would quickly become the property of the superpatriots, the single-issue constituencies, and other minions of the far right.

Thus, we wish to suggest initiatives which would instead operate from the bottom up, as grass-roots efforts to establish and build the connections which we feel are currently missing, and thereby serve to empower people to feel that they can indeed make a difference by exercising the prerogatives of citizenship:

1. We propose a volunteer service-oriented effort in which higher education faculty in the humanities and social sciences on every campus are called upon to meet with their counterparts in the public schools, along the lines of the program which Carlos E. Cortes described earlier in the seminar at his institution, to foster intellectual discussion of issues of local interest. We further suggest that such dialogue reach beyond higher education and public school faculties, and involve the public community on a local basis across the nation.

2. We urge our institutions of higher education and our public schools to also join in efforts to foster a wide variety of programs of community education and community involvement, oriented to better understand and serve the needs of their local service areas. Such efforts should expand traditional academic concentration on issues of national and international import, and focus a portion of available intellectual energy on concerns of the local community. We would anticipate a multitude of forms in which such efforts might evolve, responsive in all cases to local desires.

3. We urge that a wide variety of procedures be employed to establish connections between and among faculty in various disciplines and at various educational levels relevant to the expansion of civic learning. We have in mind such things as the following examples: current efforts at the Claremont colleges where graduate level education students are working with liberal arts faculty at the undergraduate colleges, the Association of American Colleges program in the Washington, D. C., area where university faculty visit inner-city schools to talk about their disciplines with high school students, efforts employed far too seldom

where discipline-based faculty join with professional education faculty in the process of visiting and evaluating the work of student teachers, and the kind of broad-based dialogue which Irving J. Spitzberg, Jr., mentioned earlier in the seminar among scholars in such fields as the educational foundations, the humanities, the liberal arts, the social sciences, law, and public administration.

Finally, we urge the widest possible range of initiatives which will, at a grass-roots level, encourage public service on the part of our students. We ask that all institutions experiment with tuition forgiveness, scholarships, and other ways of enticing young people to enter the education and other public service professions, and that all institutions give support to the concept of national service which would include teaching and other service activities, particularly in those urban and rural areas which desperately lack an adequate force of public servants. We would hope to see a wide variety of pilot programs of this nature.

There are obviously many more possibilities, as have been mentioned by the other discussion groups and as will occur to all of us as we continue to pursue such concerns following the seminar. It is our plea that we find ways to make the necessary connections, that we work at the campus, public school district, and local community levels to identify avenues which will foster civic learning and thereby liberate and empower our teachers and administrators and all with whom they come into contact.

In conclusion, we urge that ways also be found for us to share the results of such efforts, as a further step in fostering and expanding these necessary connections. We are certain that you will all agree that this brief seminar is only a very tentative first step, and that we must all continue to work together if we are to realize the fruits of the ideas which we have discussed these three days.

• • • •

The members of discussion group number six were: Alan H. Jones (group leader and reporter), Robert J. Kingston, John Maguire, and Suzanne Morse.

Report of Discussion Group Number Seven

Discussion group number seven agreed on the following four points:

1. The concept of civic education requires further definition and clarification. The members of our discussion group had differences between and among ourselves about the emphasis of the definition—for example: whether civic education should be defined in such a way as to be part of all the work in the school or whether it should be defined in the manner which gives special responsibility to particular disciplines, specifically in the humanities and the social sciences. But everyone agreed that none of the definitions offered in the papers of the seminar was satisfactory and that the differences between and among the papers needed to be argued out in a more sophisticated and responsive manner.

2. Even if one were to come up with an agreed-to definition of civic education and were to put in place a theoretically acceptable program of civic education, it is clear that the process of civic education would be discontinuous with the reality of the public school. It is important that those engaged in activities of the public schools and who are to be engaged in such activities as teachers understand that reality and approaches toward analyzing it. In that spirit, discussion group number

seven suggests that the realities of the public schools be approached from a number of disciplinary perspectives and that the public schools and universities and colleges be viewed as two comparative case studies for purposes of understanding each of the realities. Both social contexts require this analysis and are part of the experience of teachers in the schools. Such as analysis would ground any substantive program in reality and improve the probability of some transformation of the reality to be more consistent with the goals of civic education.

3. Our group believes strongly that there exists already a substantial base of research which could be brought to programs of civic education and the problems of the schools more generally. We recommend that a systematic effort at bibliographical research and summary be undertaken and that the research be interpreted in such a manner that it is understandable to both teachers and decision makers and can inform actual decisions. In addition, we believe that an agenda for further research should be established. An example of such agenda items would be to better understand the exact experience of the teachers who go through teacher training programs in terms of number of courses taken and the nature of those courses. This agenda should be developed as an outgrowth of the research survey and summary.

4. Discussion group number seven strongly recommends that occasions for dialogue between and among the arts and sciences faculties and those of educational studies be created in the course of developing clearer definitions of civic education and an understanding of the reality of the public schools and universities. Our discussion group was a perfect example of the possibility of practitioners of the arts and sciences and of educational studies being able to communicate cooperatively and constructively about an intellectual problem of great social importance. In a spirit of mutual respect we found that those of us from the core arts and sciences had much to learn from colleagues in educational studies, and vice versa. The spirit of respect engendered by mutual exploration in the course of the seminar provided new opportunities for greater cooperation between professionals in education and those in the arts and sciences.

• • • •

The members of discussion group number seven were: Kathryn M. Borman, James M. Giarelli, Bernard Murchland, Charles Park, Irving J. Spitzberg, Jr. (group leader and reporter), and Janice F. Weaver.

Seminar Recommendations

By Alan H. Jones

The seven discussion groups were charged with formulating initial recommendations for next steps designed to improve the civic learning of the teaching profession in the United States. While certain specifics of the various groups' recommendations differed, consensus appeared around four major topics:

Need for collaborative arrangements. Innovative arrangements must be established on as many campuses as possible through which faculty members in the humanities, social sciences, education, and such other professional schools as law and public administration, can work together in creating a coherent conceptual framework for the teaching of civic learning as a major focus of the education of the teaching profession. Such specific notions as cross-campus seminars, campus-wide policy statements, and interdisciplinary teaching and research teams were proposed, and in several instances such activities on certain campuses were noted as examples or models to be emulated.

It also stressed that such arrangements should not be restricted to the college and university setting. Rather, higher education faculty should

engage in similar dialogue with their counterparts in the public schools, as well as with a wide range of community groups. The quest for enhanced civic education of the education profession should involve all interested citizens, and should be responsive to local public concerns as well as to the contributions of the many scholarly disciplines involved.

Pilot teacher education programs. Pilot programs in teacher education should be established by colleges and universities which seek specifically to incorporate components designed to enhance the civic learning of teachers. Such programs will effectively involve faculty from many relevant disciplines, will work closely with the public schools, and will involve the many pluralistic groups within the community which profoundly affect citizenship values, attitudes, and behaviors.

Specific suggestions included a greater focus on problem solving and action learning, building grass-roots support for civic education that addresses controversial issues, sabbatical leaves for teachers to work with political and social organizations in the community as well as in other nations and cultures, experimentation with alternative curriculum models for civic learning, development of community education programs, and other initiatives which stress direct involvement with the civic life of the communities in which teachers will work. As such pilot programs prove successful, such direct features of enhanced civic learning should be incorporated into all professional preparation programs for teachers and other educational personnel.

Increased research. Additional research on the meaning and nature of civic learning should be encouraged, supported, and utilized. Such research should involve scholarship from the humanities, social sciences, education, law, public administration, and other interested disciplines, and should include historical and normative as well as empirical and behavioral analysis. The focus of such research should be on the idea and practice of citizenship, on modes of effective civic education, and on the continuing search for a widely agreed-upon definition of citizenship and civic learning.

Specific calls were issued for usable summaries of past research on civic education, for case studies of the new pilot programs, for evaluation of effective methodology in civic learning, for study of the influences of television and other mass media with respect to civic education, for a better understanding of the importance of racial integration of schools as a part of civic education, for examination of the impact of various legislative requirements on civic learning, and for further research on the potential role of public service as a part of civic

education. Once again, coalition efforts among scholars in the various disciplines is needed, and the establishment of an interdisciplinary journal to promote such research on citizenship and civic education was suggested.

Revitalization and reform. A coordinated national effort must be launched to revitalize civic education and to secure for it a high priority within the already ongoing spirit of reform of American education. To sustain the momentum of the seminar, a working committee should be established to maintain and expand the existing commitments for action, with a charge to publish and publicize results of the seminar, and to refine goals and objectives.

Specific opportunities for continuation of the work of the seminar exist in the upcoming bicentennial of the Constitution and the Bill of Rights, in the importance of enhanced civic learning in light of the increasing diversity of our nation, in proposals for a national service corps, in the development of model credential requirements for all teachers which would focus on civic learning, in the revision of national accreditation standards for teacher education to give greater importance to civic learning, in the development of policy statements outlining the responsibilities of institutions of higher education with respect to the civic learning of teachers, and in influencing the reform movement which has emanated from the several national reports on public education released in the last few years and from the major reports on higher education which are due to be released in the next two years.

While the discussion and direction of the seminar followed a highly optimistic course, it must be noted that this optimism was based on the belief that significant initiatives can be taken to dramatically increase and enhance the civic learning of the educational profession, and thereby to affect positively the civic education of all citizens. The discussion took full note of many dire societal problems, ranging from the increasing disconnectedness of American society, to the widening gulf between rich and poor, to the danger that many of our public schools will become schools only for the poor and minorities, to the cloud of gloom under which we all live given the realization that humankind possesses the ability of nuclear self-destruction. It is in response to these very problems that the seminar concluded that we must embark immediately upon a pervasive effort to permeate all of our educational, public, and private institutions with initiatives aimed at increased and effective civic education. The four categories of recommendations noted above represent only a first step in that direction.

• • • •

Alan H. Jones is executive editor of Prakken Publications, Inc., Ann Arbor, Michigan.

Bibliography

The following bibliography on civic education has been assembled from materials distributed to participants in the Seminar on Civic Learning in the Education of the Teaching Profession and from references noted by authors of the seventeen papers presented at the seminar:

Adelson, Joseph and R. O'Neil. "The Growth of Political Ideas in Adolescence: The Sense of Community," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 4, 1966.

Adler, Mortimer J. "Understanding the U.S.A.," *Journal of Teacher Education*, Vol. XXXIV, No. 6, November-December 1983.

Archambault, Reginald D., editor. *John Dewey on Education: Selected Writings*. New York: Random House, 1964.

Atlantic Council of the United States. *The Teaching of Values and the Successor Generation*, a policy paper of the Atlantic Council of the United States. Washington, D. C.: Atlantic Council of the United States, February, 1983.

Beard, Charles A. *The Nature of the Social Sciences*. New York: Charles

Scribner's Sons, 1934.

Bellah, Robert N. *The Broken Covenant: American Civil Religion in Time of Trial.* New York: Seabury, 1975.

Benne, K. D. and M. Birnbaum. "Teaching about Science and Social Policy," *The SSEC Link*, Vol. 2, No. 1, 1978.

Berryman, Charles R. and Marion J. Rice, editors. *New Directions in Social Science Teacher Education.* Athens, Ga.: Department of Social Science Education, University of Georgia, 1983.

Blalock, Hubert M., Jr. *Basic Dilemmas in the Social Sciences.* Beverly Hills, Cal.: Sage, 1984.

Boulding, Kenneth E. "Science: Our Common Heritage," *Science*, Vol. 207, 1980.

Bowers, C. A. *Cultural Literacy for Freedom.* Eugene, Ore.: Elan Publishers, 1974.

_____. *The Promise of Theory: Education and the Politics of Cultural Change.* New York: Longman, 1984.

Bridges, D. *Education, Democracy, and Discussion.* Windsor, Berks, England: NFER Publishing.

Brown, Richard Harvey. "Personal Identity and Political Economy: Languages of the Self in Civilization Perspective." Unpublished article, Department of Sociology, University of Maryland.

Butts, R. Freeman and others. *Civic Learning in Teacher Education.* Minneapolis, Minn.: Society of Professors of Education Monograph Series, 1983.

_____, guest editor. *Journal of Teacher Education*, Vol. XXXIV, No. 6, November-December 1983, special issue of 21 articles on "The Civic Education of the American Teacher."

_____. *The Revival of Civic Learning.* Bloomington, Ind.: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation, 1980.

_____. "Teacher Education and the Revival of Civic Learning," the 7th annual DeGarmo Lecture. Minneapolis, Minn.: Society of Professors of Education, 1982.

Chickering, A., editor. *The Modern American College.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1981.

Cleveland, Harlan. *The Future Executive.* New York: Harper and Row, 1972.

Cronbach, Lee J. "Beyond the Two Disciplines of Scientific Psychology," *American Psychologist*, Vol. 30, 1975.

Dewey, John. *Moral Principles in Education.* Carbondale, Ill.: Southern Illinois University Press, 1909.

_____. *The Public and Its Problems.* Denver: Allan Swallow, 1927.

Durio, H. "A Taxonomy of Democratic Development," *Human Development*, Vol. 19, 1976.

Edelman, L. "Basic American," *NOLPE School Law Journal*, Vol. 5-6, 1975-76.

Ehman, L. "The American School in the Political Socialization Process," *Review of Educational Research*, Vol. 50, 1980.

Frederickson, H. George and Ralph Clark Chandler, editors. *Public Administration Review*, March 1984, special issue on "Citizenship and Public Administration," presenting proceedings of the National Conference on Citizenship and Public Service of April 14-16, 1983.

Furth, H. *The World of Grown-Ups*. New York: Elsevier, 1980.

Gibson, William M. "Legal Education in Secondary Schools," *Journal of Legal Education*, Vol. 25, No. 2, 1973.

Gillespie, Judith A. and Howard D. Mehlinger. "Teach about Politics in the 'Real' World of the School," *Social Education*, Vol. 36, 1972.

Giroux, Henry A. "Crisis and Possibilities in Public Education," *Issues in Education*, Vol. II, No. 1, Summer 1984.

———. *Ideology, Culture, and the Process of Schooling*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1981.

Goodlad, John I. *A Place Called School: Prospects for the Future*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1984.

Hawley, W. "The Implicit Civics Curriculum: Teacher, Behavior, and Political Language," unpublished manuscript, Duke University, 1976.

Heater, D. and J. Gillespie, editors. *Political Education in Flux*. London: Sage, 1981.

Hennings, J., C. White, M. Sorgen, and L. Steltzer. *Mandate for Change: The Impact of Law on Educational Innovation*. Chicago: American Bar Association, 1979.

Hill, Barbara Ann, editor. *Liberal Education*, Winter 1982, special issue of 14 articles on "The Civic Purposes of Liberal Education."

Hoy, W. K. and R. Rees. "The Bureaucratic Socialization of Student Teachers," *Journal of Teacher Education*, Vol. 28, No. 1, 1977.

Hunter, R. and M. J. Turner. *Law-Related Education Evaluation Project: Final Report for Phase II, Year 1*. Boulder, Colo.: Law-Related Education Evaluation Project, 1981.

Jackson, M. "Assessing a Politics Skills Curriculum," *Teaching Political Science*, No. 8, 1980.

Johnson, D. W. and R. T. Johnson. "Conflict in the Classroom: Controversy and Learning," *Review of Educational Research*, Vol. 49, 1979.

Jones, Alan H. and Erskine S. Dottin, editors. *The CASA Handbook: A Chronicle of and Guide to the Work of the Committee on Academic Standards and Accreditation of the American Educational Studies Association*. Ann Arbor, Mich.: Prakken Publications, Inc., for the

American Educational Studies Association.

———, guest editor. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, Vol. 11, No. 2, Spring 1984, special issue of 11 articles on "What Are the Foundations of Teacher Education?"

Lader, Phillip. "The Teaching of Law in the Liberal Arts Curriculum of American Colleges and Universities," *Journal of Legal Education*, Vol. 25, No. 2, 1973.

Leahy, R., editor. *The Child's Construction of Social Inequality*. New York: Academic Press, 1983.

Lippmann, Walter. *A Preface to Morals*. New York: Macmillan Co., 1929.

Lortie, Dan. *Schoolteacher: A Sociological Analysis*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975.

Martin, Jane Roland. "Sophie and Emile: A Case Study of Sex Bias in the History of Educational Thought," *Harvard Educational Review*, Vol. 51, No. 3, August 1981.

Maxwell, Richard C., Joel F. Henning, and Charles J. White, III. "Legal Education in Elementary and Secondary Schools," *Journal of Legal Education*, Vol. 27, No. 2, 1975.

Meighan, R. *A Sociology of Educating*. London: Holt, 1981.

Mosenthal, P. "The Effect of Classroom Ideology on Children's Production of Narrative Text," *American Educational Research Journal*, Vol. 21, 1984.

Murchland, Bernard, editor. *The Antaeus Report*, Spring 1984, special issue on "Educating for Civic Virtue," published by the Center for the Study of Education and Society, Ohio Wesleyan University.

Nelkin, Dorothy, editor. *Controversy: Politics of Technical Decisions*. Beverly Hills, Cal.: Sage, 1984.

Okin, Susan Moller. *Women in Western Political Thought*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1980.

Oliver, Donald W. and James P. Shaver. "A Critique of 'Practice in Teaching,'" *Harvard Educational Review*, Vol. 31, 1961.

Palmer, Edward E., editor. *Problems in Democratic Citizenship*. Syracuse, N.Y.: Maxwell School of Citizenship, 1958.

Peel, E. A. *The Nature of Adolescent Judgment*. New York: Wiley, 1971.

Raywid, Mary Anne, Charles A. Tesconi, Jr., and Donald R. Warren. *Pride and Promise: Schools of Excellence for All the People*. Westbury, N.Y.: American Educational Studies Association, 1984 (Post Office Box 598, Westbury, NY 11590).

Shaver, James P. "Democracy, Courts, and the School," *Theory Into Practice*, Vol. 28, 1978.

——— and William Strong. *Facing Value Decisions: Rationale-*

Building for Teachers. New York: Teachers College Press, 1982.

Sigel, R. and M. Hoskin. *The Political Involvement of Adolescents.* New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1981.

Silberman, Charles E. *Crisis in the Classroom: The Remaking of American Education.* New York: Random House, 1970.

Sloan, Douglas, editor. *Toward the Recovery of Wholeness: Knowledge, Education, and Human Values.* New York: Teachers College Press, 1984.

Smith, K., D. W. Johnson, and R. T. Johnson. "Can Conflict Be Constructive? Controversy Versus Concurrence Seeking in Learning Groups," *American Educational Research Journal,* Vol. 23, 1981.

Spring, Joel, Maxine Greene, Christopher J. Lucas, and Donald R. Warren. *The Humanities in Education: Rebirth or Burial in the 1980s.* Ann Arbor, Mich.: Prakken Publications, Inc., for the American Educational Studies Association, 1983.

Stanley, Manfred. "Beating the System: Educational Philosophy in the City of Man," *Teachers College Record,* Vol. 83, No. 3, Spring 1982.

_____. "The Educator's Conscience from Paradise to Disneyland," *Teachers College Record,* Vol. 83, No. 1, Fall 1981.

_____. "The Mystery of the Commons: On the Indispensability of Civic Rhetoric," *Social Research,* Vol. 50, No. 4, Winter 1983.

_____. *The Technological Conscience.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981.

Stevens, O. *Children Talking Politics.* Oxford, England: Martin Robertson & Co., 1982.

Stevenson, H. and A. Siegel, editors. *Child Development and Social Policy.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984.

Sullivan, William M. *Reconstructing Public Philosophy.* Berkeley, Cal.: University of California Press, 1981.

Tabachnick, B. R., T. S. Popkewitz, and K. M. Zeichner. "Teacher Education and the Professional Perspectives of Student Teachers," *Interchange,* Vol. 10, 1980.

Torney, Judith, A. N. Oppenheim, and R. Farnen. *Civic Education in Ten Countries: An Empirical Study.* New York: Wiley, 1975.

Torney-Purta, Judith. "The Global Awareness Survey: Implications for Teacher Education," *Theory Into Practice,* Vol. 21, 1982.

Warren, Donald R. "Public Knowledge," *Journal of Thought,* Vol. 18, 1983.

Zuckerman, Michael. "Myth and Method: The Current Crisis in American Historical Writing," *The History Teacher,* Vol. 17, No. 2, February 1984.

Closing Note

Since the adjournment of the Seminar on Civic Learning in the Education of the Teaching Profession in November 1984 several participants have served as a working committee to oversee reports and publications of the event and to coordinate efforts to implement recommendations of the seminar.

Such efforts continue, and persons wishing additional information about the seminar and such ongoing activities may contact any of the following individuals:

R. Freeman Butts, Visiting Scholar, Hoover Institution on War, Revolution and Peace, Stanford University, Stanford, California 94305

Diane U. Eisenberg, Executive Director, Council for the Advancement of Citizenship, One Dupont Circle N. W., Suite 520, Washington, D. C. 20036

Alan H. Jones, Executive Editor, Prakken Publications, Inc., Post

Office Box 8623, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48107

Charles N. Quigley, Executive Director, Center for Civic Education/Law in a Free Society, 5115 Douglas Fir Drive, Suite I, Calabasas, California 91302

END

DEPT. OF EDUCATION

NAT'L INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

ERIC

DATE FILMED

NOVEMBER

7 _1985